

Nesterova, Y. (2019) Multiculturalism and multicultural education approaches to Indigenous people's education in Taiwan. *Multicultural Education Review*, 11(4), pp. 253-270. (doi: [10.1080/2005615X.2019.1686561](https://doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2019.1686561)).

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/216295/>

Deposited on: 26 May 2020

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education Approaches to Indigenous People's Education in Taiwan

Taiwan has cast multicultural policies as a remedy for inequalities and injustices its 16 Indigenous groups face. Such policies aim to revive Indigenous languages and cultures and create a more welcoming and inclusive environment in schools. Despite the fact that Indigenous people are expected to be primary beneficiaries of these policies, not much is known about how they have affected Indigenous students and communities, if at all. Relying on in-depth semi-structured interviews with 16 Indigenous participants, this paper explores whether the policies have accomplished or are on the way to accomplishing the goals set, as seen by Indigenous people. The findings show that the multicultural approach to education is still informed by assimilationist logic that expects Indigenous people to adjust to the culture and orientations of the dominant group, and as such, does not redress the existing injustices and inequalities.

Character count: 54,032

Introduction

Since 1624 the Indigenous people on the island that is now known as Taiwan saw the establishment of colonial settlements on their land from diverse outside powers ranging from European (Portuguese, Dutch, and Spanish) to Asian (Chinese and Japanese). During this period, Indigenous groups went through forceful relocation, military subjugation, and harsh assimilationist policies that intended to 'civilize' them (Cauquelin, 2011; Pawan, 2004). Enforcement of a new type of education was viewed as the primary force to rid Indigenous people of their 'savagery' by 'civilizing' them into the 'superior' identity, culture, language, and ethics of the new rulers (Teng, 2004). The 'civilizing' methods included uprooting of Austronesian cultures, languages, and identities of the Indigenous people and replacing them with those of the dominant, ruling group (Morris, 2007; Simon, 2002).

The process of 'civilization' through assimilation intensified during the Japanese colonial rule (1895-1945) and martial law under the Chinese Nationalist Party (1949-1987). Assimilation has led to gradual destruction of Indigenous lifestyles, traditional

structures, and communities, and erosion of Indigenous languages, knowledge systems, identities, and cultures (Hsieh, 2006; Su, 2006). It has also pushed Indigenous people from the place of being the masters of the island and their own fate to a minority comprising only 2.39% of the population and having no control over their own development or that of society's political, social, and economic domains (see Chi, 2012; International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), 2019). Centuries of domination and subjugation have brought economic and social marginalization and fragmentation to Indigenous communities and created a stereotyped image of an indolent, addictive, and illiterate 'Other' leading to discrimination against and low self-esteem and self-respect among Indigenous people (Chen & Young, 2015; Yen, 2009).

As martial law was repealed in 1987, Taiwan started transition from authoritarianism and repression of human and Indigenous rights and freedoms to democratization and Taiwanization/localization of development (Cauquelin, 2011; Law, 2002). Two of the features of this transition were re-discovery of ethnic and linguistic diversity of the island to establish a locally-rooted identity and culture for a cohesive and harmonious nation-building, and removal of injustices that laid barriers to Indigenous people's academic and socio-economic advancement. To aid this transitional process, 'multicultural Taiwan' was chosen as the national identity and strategy to work towards (Wang, 2004), and multicultural education – as a remedy to the inequalities and injustices Indigenous people have been experiencing in academic settings and beyond. This shift to multiculturalism was sustained by the development and implementation of new educational policies and standards including the *Indigenous Education Act* that was introduced in 1998 to improve Indigenous people's experiences and outcomes in mainstream educational institutions (Nesterova, 2019).

Based on a qualitative study across Taiwan's regions, this paper discusses whether multiculturalism in its current conceptualization and implementation in Taiwan has been responding to the complex and multifaceted matters experienced by the most disadvantaged group in the society – Indigenous people. The paper starts by introducing Taiwan's Indigenous people, their geographical, social, and cultural make-up and moves to explore the conceptions of Taiwan's multiculturalism(s) promoted by the two parties that have governed Taiwan since 1987 – Kuomintang/the Chinese Nationalist Party (henceforth, KMT) and the Democratic Progressive Party (henceforth, DPP) and their implementation in mainstream education system. After that, it presents Indigenous voices that examine and reflect on these multicultural ideas, policies, and practices to determine how effectively (or not) they work towards the set goals of revival of Indigenous identities and cultures and addressing injustices and inequalities Indigenous people face. The paper concludes by highlighting implications for multicultural education for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Taiwan and beyond.

Indigenous people of Taiwan

As a multi-lingual and multi-cultural society, Taiwan hosts such major ethnic groups as Han Chinese (divided into Hakka, Waisheng or mainland Chinese, and Minnan) and the Indigenous people. While the Han Chinese settlers started moving to Taiwan in the 17th centuries, the exact date of Indigenous people's settlement on the island is not known. Nevertheless, archaeological records show that already in 300 AD Austronesians sailed from Taiwan to the Philippines and other parts of the world, influencing languages and cultures of the Maori, Indonesians, Hawaiians, and others (Coca, 2013).

The Indigenous people are further divided into 16 officially recognized groups and at least 9 groups referred to as *ping pu* who are seeking state-level recognition. The recognized groups comprise approximately 565,043 people, or 2.39% of the population of the island (IWGIA, 2019). While they all belong to the Austronesian family and have a shared history of colonization and assimilation, they differ in size, inhabit different areas across the island, and exhibit differences in their socio-cultural organization (see Table 1). After centuries of colonization by outside powers, the main concerns the Indigenous people grapple with include disappearing cultures and languages, low socio-economic status, and limited political and economic influence (IWGIA, 2019).

Table 1. Recognized Indigenous Groups: Demographics, Locations, Characteristics

№	Name	Population	Location	Characteristics
1	Amis	177,000	Hualien and Taitung	Matrilineal system of social organization: female leadership of the private sphere (including property ownership), male leadership of the public sphere (laws, tribal politics, and others).
2	Paiwan	86,000	Sandimen and Taitung	The chief should be of the noble class. The chief acts as the leader in politics, military, and religion.
3	Atayal	81,000	New Taipei, Hualien, Hsinchu, Nantou	Facial tattoos are a long-standing tradition. Ancestral worship rituals are the key social/religious activity. Red clothes are favored as it represents blood that drives evil spirits away.
4	Bunun	50,000	Nantou, Kaohsiung, Eastern Taiwan	Patriarchal social structure; family members may include non-family blood relation; schedule their ceremonies according to millet planting, weeding, and harvest.
5	Truku	24,000	Taroko Gorge	Were at the forefront fighting the Japanese invasion; still keep their traditional technique of shaman sorcery and worship ancestors in special ceremonies every year.

6	Puyuma	11,000	Taitung	Divided into 8 sub-tribes that have different mythology about their creation; have 2 traditional systems of social organization: 1. family system with inheritance by the eldest daughter, and 2. organized by the different ages of men.
7	Rukai	11,600	Taitung and Wutai	Traditional social structure is comprised of commoners and nobles; with the latter have more economic and land privileged; commoners can be elevated to nobility through leadership and harvest production.
8	Sediq	10,000	Nantou	Traditional religion is based on 'utux', which means 'ancestral spirits'. Disrespecting utux brings disaster and misfortune. The group has the mosy conscious living, worships Sisin, the sacred bird, and makes decisions based on the sound the bord makes.
9	Tsou	6,500	Alishan	Very strict patriarchal structure; the social and political organization includes small and large well-organized clans; all decisions are made by men. Major ceremonies include war ritual and ancestral spirit worship.
10	Saisiyat	5,300	Hsinchu and Miaoli	Patriarchal structure of the tribe with women having no authority and inheritance rights for men only; consists of a number of sub-tribes that have equal status in relation to each other.
11	Dao	3,500	Orchid Island	Live offshore, isolated from the other groups, as a result, culture is relatively intact; social affairs are run by male heads of households and community's fishing groups. Famous for traditional boats, female hair dances.
12	Kavalan	1,100	Hualien and Yilan	The group believes that each living and non-living creature has its own spirit; has special offering ceremony and healing ceremony performed by a female shaman.

13	Thao	648	Sun Moon Lake	Patriarchal society; tribal chief, the position is inherited by the eldest son, is the main decision maker. The group was strongly influenced by the Chinese, but still holds to its traditions, one of them is having a basket with ancestor spirit at home.
14	Kanakanavu	520	Kaohsiung	Patrilineal society; has ceremonies to express gratitude for millet that is part of their daily diet and to the river for fish and other resources.
15	Hlaaula	400	Kaohsiung	Currently 3 main communities that are led by individual hereditary leaders and an assembly of elders and chiefs that make decisions about public affairs.
16	Sakizaya	335	Hualien (among Amis people)	Matrilineal system, a man moves to his wife's house after marriage. Fishing and hunting are traditional ways of life. 'Miamaiivaki' is the ceremony in which elders give regards to young group members.

Multicultural education

In this work, multicultural education is defined as “education that aims to respond to the presence of diversity and inequality in society” (Jackson, 2014a, p. 12). It does so by defining the overall approach to education that further influences curriculum development and other related practices. Jackson (2014a) differentiates between assimilationist and pluralist approaches to multiculturalism. Assimilationist approach sees differences between groups as deficiencies and barriers to equality and social progress. Minority groups are expected to abandon their cultural practices and orientations and adjust to those of the dominant group. Education then plays a role of the initiator of these disadvantaged groups into the values, mannerism, and practices of the broader society.

Jackson (2014a) contrasts assimilationism with pluralist approach which she divides into multiculturalism and critical multiculturalism. The former views cultural and social difference as good and worthy of public recognition and toleration and posits that dismissing diverse cultural representations and references harm minorities, their self-esteem and identity. The latter rejects the status quo that keeps minorities in an inferior and disadvantaged position and calls it unjust and unethical. Education through multicultural lens looks to preserve diverse cultures and teach their members to live peacefully together, whereas critical multicultural education also works to dismantle oppressive structures that disadvantage and marginalize minority groups.

In school contexts, critical multiculturalism does so by self-consciously and critically assessing, challenging, and rejecting racism, discrimination, and unequal power dynamics in policies and practices and their negative impact on marginalized and vulnerable students (Nieto, 2005). Schools that adopt critical multiculturalism as its philosophy, first, affirm pluralism represented by their staff, students, and their communities and incorporate diverse knowledges, histories, and value systems into a teaching-learning paradigm in an ethical and responsible manner (see May, 1999; Nieto, 2000). Second, they emphasize a proactive and conscious engagement with issues of social justice to transform “the diverse histories, cultural narratives, representations, and institutions that produce racism and other forms of discrimination” (Giroux, 1995, p. 328) and construct just, equitable, “culturally responsive and responsible practice[s]” (Ukpokodu, 2003, p. 19).

As far as multicultural curriculum is concerned, Banks (1989) proposes four types. Contributions type keeps curriculum structure and goals unchanged while focusing on integrating certain ethnic and cultural references such as ethnic heroes, food, music, and dance on specific days. This approach is the easiest for teachers to

adopt, but it teaches nothing about ethnic groups and tends to “gloss over important concepts and issues related to the victimization and oppression of ethnic groups and their struggles against racism and for power” (Banks, 1989, p. 17).

Additive type adds to the existing curriculum some selected literature, units or courses that discuss topics related to ethnic and cultural diversity issues. While there is a certain addition in this type, no fundamental changes are made in the curriculum, and content is chosen by the dominant group to comply with criteria and perspectives of the mainstream society. This approach fails to equip students with skills to see their society from differing perspectives and to understand connections between histories and cultures of diverse groups. As Ladson-Billings (2003) explains, this approach leaves the “monocultural, exclusive narrative” unchallenged (p. 9).

Transformation type sets to change basic assumptions in the curriculum. Similar to critical multiculturalism, it integrates diverse concepts, problems, perspectives, and references to make students look at different issues and events from differing worldviews and points of view. Curriculum undergoes fundamental changes to integrate a variety of (divergent) perspectives, meanings, and content to fully understand the complexity of their society. Finally, decision-making and social action type is an enhanced transformation type as it also aims to equip students with such skills as research skills, political efficacy, critical thinking, and critical decision-making and action.

Multicultural education and Indigenous people in Taiwan

Despite being the authoritarian ruler that established martial law in 1949, the KMT was the party that – though under immense pressure – initiated and carried through the transition to democracy, remaining the principal power until 2000 when Chen Shui-bian

of the DPP became the president of Taiwan (Caldwell, 2018). KMT won presidential elections in 2008 and remained in power until 2016 when another DPP's choice, a woman politician with Indigenous ancestry, Tsai Ing-wen was elected president. It is these two parties' politics that have been shaping multiculturalism and multicultural education that affected Indigenous education in Taiwan in the democratic period: KMT from 1987 to 2000 and from 2008 to 2016 and DPP from 2000 to 2008 and from 2016 until now.

For both parties, multiculturalism acted as a way to address two acute matters facing the society in transition to democracy. One was formation of a new identity of Taiwan's citizens and the other – finding remedies for inequalities and injustices experienced by Indigenous and other minority groups (Cheng, 2004; Ku, 2012). If the views on identity formation have seen certain fundamental differences between the parties due to their political and geopolitical directions (especially relationships and ties with Mainland China), their approaches to addressing inequalities Indigenous groups experience have been much the same.

KMT multiculturalism started as a response to the need to deconstruct the coercively imposed uniform and nationalist Chinese identity and build a new identity to reflect the society's multicultural heritage and liberal democratic values in post-authoritarian era (Jackson, 2014b). The KMT model of multiculturalism is hierarchal as it places the dominant Chinese culture on top followed by all the other island's minority cultures (e.g., Indigenous, Hakka). This approach was best described by the former president Lee Teng Hui of the KMT party who, talking about the Indigenous population of Taiwan, said that they “have to ‘melt’ into Taiwanese society” without which they “cannot exist” (Wang, 2004, p. 307).

Critics of KMT multiculturalism suggest that highlighting Indigenous and minority cultures as part of multicultural Taiwan and its multicultural education was a way to form a new nationalism (Wang, 2004) and to pacify “an unrestful Taiwan population” (Mao, 1997, p. 404). Indigenous cultures were not viewed as worthy to survive in their entirety and standing on their own, without integration into the dominant Chinese structure. Efforts were therefore directed at preserving the parts of it and addressing the needs of Indigenous people that could be tolerated in the mainstream sinocentric society and education (Mao, 1997).

KMT has taken a series of actions to enact their model of multicultural Taiwan. The first action was the 1992 amendment of the Constitution to pledge assistance to Indigenous cultural and language revival. The amendment intended to allocate funding and other support to promote and teach Indigenous languages and cultures and conduct research on Indigenous issues. As Tsao (1997) shows, only a small number of intended activities were even started or completed, and most of them were too impractical, small-scale, and in some cases too late to be able to address the urgent issues Indigenous communities faced (e.g., language and knowledge loss and structural injustices).

In 1996 the Commission on Education Reform implemented a new educational policy referred to as ‘dual cultural identities’ attempting to aid the revival of Indigenous identities (Huang, 2007). The policy failed to produce positive results as Indigenous children were still educated in predominantly Chinese environment. Such education distressed their Indigenous identities and mother tongue skills as Mandarin was used as the only language of instruction while Indigenous languages were labelled as “informal, useless, playful, traditional and backward” (Huang, 2007, p. 16). The consequence of this treatment of Indigenous languages was their continued destruction: the 2004 survey

showed that only 9% of Indigenous children could speak their respective Indigenous mother tongues (Pawan, 2004). Despite that, KMT-led multicultural reforms in 1990s, including that of the introduction of the *Twelve Education Reform Mandates* in 1998 led to a more integrated multicultural curriculum that focused on diversity, local issues, respect and protection of diverse cultures, and prevention of prejudice and discrimination (Jackson, 2014b).

Another key measure taken by KMT in support of Indigenous development, for example, includes recognizing Indigenous groups as Indigenous or *yuan-chu-min* 原住民族 in Chinese (“original people’s group”) through amendments in the Constitution in 1994 (Kingsbury, 1998). This move gave them – at least on paper – powers and rights to control their development and receive support to carry required changes through. Introduction of the *Education Act for Indigenous Peoples* in 1998 (amended in 2015) was another positive development that gave Indigenous communities the right to establish their own educational spaces and structures, promote Indigenous languages, history, and culture in mainstream institutions, and ensure that discrimination, racism, and misrepresentation are addressed. Initiatives that emerged ensured access for Indigenous children to quality schools (Cheng, 2004) and additional points for passing the National Proficiency Test of Aboriginal Languages (PTAL) to be admitted to tertiary institutions (Rudolph, 2016). Yet, the schools that serve Indigenous students, still tend to lack adequate funding, resources, facilities, and qualified teachers (Chou, 2005; Nesterova, 2019).

DPP’s need for multiculturalism, especially with the focus on legitimizing Indigenous identities, stemmed from the political necessity to ensure sovereignty from Mainland China (Ku, 2012). As a result, it has led to a slightly different model of

multiculturalism that prioritizes the so-called localized Taiwanese culture followed in the hierarchy by Chinese and then global cultures (including Japanese, Western, and migrant workers from other Asian states). The Taiwanese culture in this case is a merger of diverse cultures that developed on the island prior to martial law. It thus incorporates the cultures of Hoklo and Hakka people (Chinese people who started settling in Taiwan in the 17th century) and those of Indigenous people that belong to the Austronesian family (Wang, 2004).

The DPP model was put forward by president Chen Shui-bian who envisioned a mosaic of cultures that would live peacefully with each other to create, what he called, a harmonious symphony (Wang, 2004). Despite the theoretical shift from a hierarchy to mosaic of cultures and a more substantial acknowledgement of Indigenous identities in shaping the local culture and identity, Chen's idea was hardly widely accepted.

Indigenous cultures are still seen as comprising an insignificant part of the local Taiwanese culture (2.39% of the population as opposed to approximately 70% of the Hoklo people of Chinese ancestry) and as a consequence were in need to melt into the Taiwanese identity. Nevertheless, president Chen officially announced in 2001 that multiculturalism would be the national policy to help reaffirm democracy (Law, 2002) and identity of Taiwanese people (Mason, 2009). In relation to Indigenous people, in 1999 Chen's administration developed a "New Partnership" agreement to aid work on Indigenous autonomy and related powers (Chi, 2007). A positive development of this decision has been the change from treating the Indigenes as a monolithic and homogenous ethnic group to treating them as individual groups (Rudolph, 2016).

Apart from the concerns for the development of a new identity and revival of Indigenous cultures and languages, another urgent matter for KMT and DPP has been

academic underachievement of Indigenous students. In different periods it was determined by Taiwan-based studies that Indigenous children do not succeed academically in mainstream educational institutions due to their cultural differences from the mainstream (see Lee & Chen, 2014; S.-H. Chen, 2015; P. Chen, 2012; Huang, 2007). Indigenous cultural difference has been seen as cultural deficiency that prevented Indigenous children from adjusting to the learning environment and academic expectations of Taiwan's schooling.

The remedy that would correct such problematic experiences was found in multicultural education that was executed in educational institutions in the form of introduction of performative Indigenous cultures. Multicultural education then became restricted to what Taiwan's scholars refer to as "artsy" (Wang, 2014) and "touristy" (Chou, 2005) practices. Chi (2012, p. 3) pointed out that such practices manifest in "the celebration of distinct cultural expressions and performances." Such decisions are made due to the superficial understanding of multiculturalism (Fenelon & LeBeau, 2006), the needs of Indigenous people, and the stereotypical image of Indigenous groups as people who lead "carefree lives singing and dancing" (Gao, 2001).

Chou (2005) blamed this on ethnic and racial blindness of Taiwan's multicultural policies. The studies conducted by Cheng (2004) and Yen (2009) also determined that it is racist attitudes of non-Indigenous teachers who lack knowledge about Indigenous people and skills to engage with them and instead, stereotype and discriminate against Indigenous people, their cultures and identities. The danger is not only that such unhealthy environment in schools leads to lack of motivation to study on behalf of Indigenous children. This focus on artistic expression of Indigenous groups, lack of accurate and comprehensive representation of them in the classroom, and

unwillingness to address racism perpetuate stereotypes and prejudices about Indigenous people and their lifestyles (Su, 2006; 2007) and diminish the complexity and intersectionality of their identities (Gorski, 2016) to dance, song, and ‘costume’.

The focus on artistic and touristy components of Indigenous cultures can be a consequence not purely of misunderstanding of multiculturalism, but of intentional pursuit of economic benefits from the ‘exotic’ cultures of Indigenous people. The Austronesian identity of the Indigenes has been used as backdoor diplomacy to establish neo-liberal free trade contracts with countries with Austronesian population in the Pacific (Friedman, 2018) and to sign memorandums of understanding with Canada and Australia which certainly resulted in benefits of intercultural exchange between Indigenous people of Taiwan, Canada, and Australia (Munsterhjelm, 2002). Locally, the stereotypical identity of a joyous, dancing, and singing Indigene has been recreated to promote tourism within Taiwan and to showcase Indigenous people at national events (Munsterhjelm, 2002) to solidify a localized Taiwanese identity. To accomplish this, Indigenous people are expected to be more authentic than authentic to be attractive to the outsiders. This condition fractures Indigenous communities and hampers the development of strong Indigenous identities and cultures effectively forcing the Indigenes to focus on “local authenticity at the expense of other forms of legitimacy” (Friedman, 2018, p. 97).

It should be admitted that the KMT and DPP multicultural policies and practices have opened up possibilities of revival of Indigenous cultures and search for identities. As Jackson’s (2014b) analysis of Taiwan’s curriculum suggests, education *has* become less assimilationist and more multicultural. Nevertheless, neither parties have managed to respond to these needs in a more profound manner nor have they been able to address

more structural and complex matters hampering Indigenous development (Shih, 2010). The focus on Indigenous artistic performances alone conceals a more urgent need in developing Indigenous communities – the need to not only revive Indigenous worldviews, knowledge systems, and philosophies, but to address racial and socio-economic inequalities and injustices (St. Denis, 2011).

Materials and methods

This study is a part of a larger qualitative research project on the development of Indigenous education conducted in Taiwan. The qualitative research design was selected as the aim of the project was to understand the “phenomenon from the views of the participants” (Creswell, 2009, p. 16). Apart from that, a qualitative inquiry allowed to establish close contacts with the participants to develop trust and rapport which helped them to open up and be willing to let the researcher to come for any clarifications and additional information. The use of interviews also enabled more comprehensive discussions about the matter under study as the participants spent extended periods of time with the researcher.

The data were collected during a fieldwork across Taiwan in August 2016. Sixteen Indigenous people participated in in-depth semi-structured interviews evaluating and reflecting on the education policies implemented during 1990s and 2000s. The participants included six Taiwan’s Indigenous leaders (IL) and ten professors (P) all of whom work to assist Indigenous communities’ development and promotion of Indigenous cultures, knowledge, and education (see Table 2). They came from diverse Indigenous groups (e.g., Amis, Bunun, Puyuma, Paiwan, and others) in which they were considered as respected and trusted leaders by their people. All participants were all above the age of 35 to ensure that in their interviews they could

rely on their substantial experience (at least 10 years) in Indigenous affairs and understanding of the complexities and factors of Indigenous development within the local and global contexts.

Table 2. Profiles of interview participants

Participant	Location	Primary Fields of Expertise
P1	Taichung	Professor: Indigenous education, Indigenous language, Indigenous culture
P2	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous and minority languages and education, multiculturalism
P3	Hualien	Professor: Indigenous rights, justice, land rights, political science and law
P4	Tainan	Professor: Indigenous knowledge, Higher Education
P5	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous rural education, cultural revival
P6	Taichung	Professor: Justice, Indigenous rights, Indigenous economic development
P7	Taichung	Professor: Indigenous development, cultural revival
P8	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous language education, urban indigenous communities
P9	Hualien	Professor: Indigenous grassroots political movement, Indigenous education, Indigenous language
P10	Tainan	Professor: Indigenous education, Indigenous languages
IL1	Taichung	Indigenous education, cultural revival
IL2	Taitung	Indigenous rights, Indigenous governance, cooperation between and among groups
IL3	Taitung	Indigenous rights, cultural revival
IL4	Hualien	Indigenous rights, grassroots movement for education, language and cultural revival
IL5	Hualien	Rural indigenous development, environmental sustainability
IL6	Hualien	Immersion schools for indigenous children, rural development

As the participants live across Taiwan – from the western and more developed cities of Taichung and Tainan where Indigenous people were affected by colonization most to the eastern part of Hualien and Taitung where the mountains provided a barrier that kept the colonial powers away for a much longer period of time – the interviews took place in these four cities and counties. Each interview lasted from one hour to two hours and a half. The interviews were conducted in English except for one that required Chinese-English interpreters and two others that asked for an interpreter to be present in case they would have difficulty in expressing themselves. The interpreters were two Indigenous women with full proficiency in the languages of the study and accepted members in the Indigenous communities the participant came from. All the interviews were audio-recorded with the written consent of the participants after the aim of the study, its procedure, potential benefits and consequences had been discussed in detail. After that, each interview was transcribed verbatim in English, and in the case of the interviews conducted (partly or fully) in Chinese, Chinese and English transcriptions were done and cross-checked by another interpreter fluent in two languages.

To analyze the data, cross-sectional and case studies approach were used. The cross-sectional method consisted of identifying common themes, categories, and patterns and after that merging the participants' responses under them, comparing and contrasting their views and insights. Then, each participant's story was approached as an individual case to tell a distinct story or narrative about the topic of the study.

Results

Two distinctive policies

Discussing Taiwan's multicultural policies, all participants agreed that Indigenous people should not side with either of the two leading parties as no party prioritizes

Indigenous needs. Despite that, they all shared that if they compare how Indigenous people have been treated by KMT and DPP during the democratization period, they referred to KMT policies as “assimilationist” and “welfare colonialis[t]” whereas DPP is viewed as a more “localized” and “Indigenized” party capable of more profound multicultural reforms. As an Indigenous leader (#IL6) recounted:

There is a very long history for the KMT as a ruling party. ... their main policy - we can call it colonizing, assimilation. So, it is hardly you can hear during their regime that the so-called multiculturalism or even the respect Indigenous traditional culture and knowledge, the language... and revitalize it, it's very hard. But the more Indigenized and localized the party DPP, it is very ... On the contrary, they want to be with the Indigenous people, and they have to understand that they somehow have the same fate with the Indigenous people.

Inequality in resources and representation in education

Nevertheless, the participants were united in saying that the existing multicultural policies – whether they were issued by KMT or DPP – are not sufficient for creating a multicultural society. The reason is that the authorities and institutions do not pay due attention to the revival of Indigenous cultures, languages, and knowledge(s), strengthening of Indigenous identities, or dealing with academic underachievement, low socio-economic status, and discrimination against Indigenous people. This lack of real engagement with Indigenous issues on behalf of the authorities is a major concern Indigenous people have regarding their own development. As they shared, since the establishment of the quasi-ministerial Council of Indigenous Peoples (CIP) in 1996, the responsibility to manage Indigenous education has been placed on this institution that is often under-funded and lacks power similar to the Ministry of Education (MOE), for example. As a professor (#P5) explained:

Even if they think they are doing multiculturalism. But I don't buy it. Because they don't really think about how this Indigenous peoples' education, to revitalize our language. They think that it's business of CIP, not the government. ... And, actually, one of the problems related to Indigenous education is that MOE they take control of general education, and CIP need to

deal with Indigenous education. Sometimes if you want to do something for Indigenous education, there is a problem with this two. MOE is higher status than CIP, they have more money.

Despite the responsibility being placed on CIP, the institution does not only have limited finances or power, it has no control over mainstream education the vast majority of Indigenous and non-Indigenous students attend. Schools are managed by MOE that determines the structure, content, pedagogy, and other academic matters. As it was noted by the participants, all the decisions are informed by the dominant Chinese conceptions of education and societal success, and this is also reflected in the educational approach and the teaching contents and pedagogy that are the same for Indigenous and non-Indigenous students. In terms of the multicultural educational approach, a professor (#P8) observed:

There is something like culture plus approach. Where basically you have the mainstream culture and then you add on a few days, classes a week to learn about each local culture.

The culture plus approach also includes adding cultural events where Indigenous people are asked to wear traditional clothing and perform traditional songs and dances to parents of non-Indigenous students. Apart from being viewed as exploitative and superficial, the participants said that this approach to education, teaching, and content:

... is not fair. You cannot teach every child the same thing, the same cultures, the same languages. Because children are from different background. How can you do that? We call that 'assimilationist policies' (#P1).

Languages and education

Language policy and language use are two other areas that shows the "failure" of the multicultural approach. Reflecting on the language policy, a professor (#P1) stated that:

The government might say they are using the multiculturalism policy for Indigenous peoples, but I don't think so. They provided us with a language policy and language lessons in early childhood education. In pre-school it is one class once a week. It is lesser than learning English. English, I believe, it's

two hours per week. You can see the difference. And the government will tell you, this is what I give you, at least this is something. But this is not enough.

It was explained by the others that each lesson of an Indigenous language lasts only 40 minutes, and it may not take place every week as such “insignificant classes” get cancelled in favour of math test or a sports event. Additionally, although it is a 40-minute class, there are only around 15 minutes of the actual language lesson because a teacher can sing or read something in an Indigenous language, but all explanations come in Mandarin. Such an arrangement makes it hard to master a language.

Another professor (#P7) shared:

It doesn't matter where you go, Mandarin is everywhere. Chinese culture, conceptions are everywhere. And even at home we can't learn about our culture and our language, as our people don't speak this language.

The issue, however, is not only with the loss of Indigenous languages and related knowledge as there is no space to learn and practice them. What worries the participants is that education in Chinese environment with the Chinese language, culture, and knowledge system, makes it challenging for Indigenous students to find meaning, belonging, and identity in the education they receive thus complicating their adjustment to the system and understanding of the material. As one Indigenous leader (#IL6) explained, echoing the other participants, “... for Indigenous people, it is difficult to learn their system, we need to overcome these difficulties that come from language and culture.”

Inequity of educational opportunity

As most of the participants expressed the difficulty stems from the policies being “simply not fair” as they do not have equal educational opportunity. By educational opportunity these participants do not mean educational access because access is ensured by law. What they focus on instead is a form of multiculturalism sensitive to Indigenous needs: one that acknowledges their languages, cultures, identities, traditions, histories, and lifestyles. As participants concluded, they are provided with equal access to good schools. The problem, however, is that many Indigenous students drop out of these schools that are not trained nor willing to deal with Indigeneity.

Unsatisfactory content of education

Dropping out of school and unsatisfactory academic achievements of those who finish schools are also a result of insensitive content of education which slows down their progress and/or makes the environment unbearable. The participants shared that the content represents Indigenous people as “barbarians” willing to assimilate to a civilized culture of the settlers. For this, textbooks use stories to promote a particular narrative. For example, a professor (#P1) stated that:

The textbook doesn’t talk about the contribution of Indigenous people. They talk only a little bit about Indigenous peoples. And they bring stereotypical image of Indigenous people.

All the participants agreed that the history of colonization of the island has been ignored. Instead, Chinese people are presented as pioneers on the quest to civilize barbarian and primitive Indigenous people. They said:

They talk about colonialism in a positive way. They say pioneering of Indigenous land. They try to say that barbarians were civilized. They still say that. They still think that we are primitive (#P1).

As a result, the participants argued, children may be afraid to share that they are Indigenous as some non-Indigenous people “still would joke about that word ‘barbarian’” (#IL4) and share degrading stories of Indigenous “savage cultures” (#P5). Such a view of Indigenous people as being uncivilized and barbarian, it was retorted, leads to discrimination and racist attacks and treatment by non-Indigenous people.

Learning about Indigeneity in schools

What is of concern is that education about Indigenous people is not part of the curriculum in Taiwan. This has created a situation when Indigenous people know everything about the dominant group and non-Indigenous people have no or limited knowledge about Indigenous people and their – in parts oppressive – history with the Chinese majority group. Very often such knowledge is based on stereotypes and misrepresentation which creates resentment on the part of Indigenous people. Some participants shared that “they [the dominant Chinese group] learn little about us” (#P2)

and “they don’t want to know anything” (#P7). The result, the Indigenous participants said, is that there is no understanding by non-Indigenous people of what changes are required to address the struggles of Indigenous people in the mainstream society and education system. Most of them reflected that the dominant group does not know about the reality Indigenous people live in and mostly sees them through a negative lens.

They think we are not good people, we are inferior, and they have to help us. ... They stigmatize us, and we stigmatize ourselves. It’s psychological, very negative influence (#IL6).

Such lack of knowledge and understanding by the dominant group is not viewed in society as problematic despite the fact that institutions, including the MOE, deal with Indigenous affairs with no comprehensive understanding of Indigenous contexts and needs. As it was mentioned by 15 participants, non-Indigenous institutions are unwilling to get to know and understand Indigenous people, their affairs and values, and, thus are not able to do much to help Indigenous communities. One professor (#P1) maintained that:

MOE does have a unit that deals with Indigenous education. It is small. In that unit they don’t understand Indigenous education. That unit need to have more people who are familiar with Indigenous education, language, culture.

Colonization of Indigenous mind

Lack of knowledge about Indigenous cultures, affairs, and related matters among the dominant group representatives and institutions is not the only worry. The real problem, repeated by everyone in the study, is that the Indigenous mind is colonized and is overreliant on the dominant structures and mentality. An Indigenous leader (#IL6) put it neatly:

We are double-blind. One blind for our knowledge, the other for theirs. We don’t have the opportunity, time, or space to learn our ways, ourselves.

Multicultural education, therefore, for them would mean not only the dominant society learning about Indigenous history and heritage as well as colonial legacy that has affected them. It should also include Indigenous people learning about themselves, recognizing and respecting their cultures, re-building and strengthening their identities, and reviving and maintaining their cultures, languages, and traditions.

Uniqueness of Indigeneity

In addition, it was emphasized throughout the interviews, multiculturalism in Taiwan cannot be developed with the benefit for Indigenous people if the “uniqueness and value of each group” (#IL3) is not recognized. In relation to education, the participants shared, this concerns the difference of mentalities, values, knowledges, languages, and identities Indigenous and non-Indigenous people have. Multiculturalism in the view of these participants should mean development of “each group in its own unique cultural way while developing together at the same time by working as a team” (#P4). This way, Indigenous participants believe, multicultural Taiwan will be possible.

Discussion

Multicultural approach

Looking at the construction of multiculturalism in Taiwan, we can see some progression of Taiwan’s multicultural education in the past few decades. The dominant rhetoric has shifted from seeing the dominant Chinese culture as superior and those of Indigenous people as barbarian and uncivilized (assimilationism) to acknowledging the existence of Indigenous cultures and seeing their contribution, although restricted to certain expressions and monitored (and disciplined?) by the dominant group, as valuable (pluralism: multiculturalism).

The approach is, however, still mixed and informed more by assimilationism than multiculturalism. Taiwan's Indigenes are still expected to adjust to the culture and orientations of the dominant group when in the public sphere, not revive and expand their own, Indigenous cultural references. Their presence, cultures, and identities are tolerated and even praised by the wider society for their artistic performances that contribute to visible diversity, construction of counter-Mainland Chinese identity, and the economic domain through tourism.

Multicultural education policies aim to preserve Indigenous cultures allegedly to benefit Indigenous people. However, preservation concerns only some tolerable Indigenous characteristics such as dance, song, and costume for someone else's entertainment and monetary benefit while putting Indigenous cultures and identities in a box where they cannot develop, change, and adjust for fear of not being seen 'authentic'. That which does not fit within the boundaries of the dominant epistemology and ontology and which cannot therefore be tolerated should then be "domesticated" or "made similar," as Andreotti (2011) explains.

Another example that showcases assimilationism of Taiwan's multiculturalism is the establishment of a semi-efficient under-funded Indigenous government in the form of CIP that is charged with dealing with Indigenous issues that the dominant institutions (including MOE and mainstream schools) do not take on. This shows that Indigenous matters are pushed into its own domain that does not intersect or work substantially with the public domain that is led and shaped by the dominant group with little, if any, contribution by the Indigenes. As a result, multicultural policies that are expected to benefit Indigenous communities, have done little for them.

Another problematic side of Taiwan's multiculturalism is that multicultural education is not seen as substantial or genuine and can be argued to be done for the

wrong reasons. Unlike Jackson's conceptualization of multiculturalism that sees refusal to integrate minorities' cultural references into the majority culture as harming minority's self-esteem and identity, in Taiwan the reforms are enacted not to develop and strengthen Indigenous self-respect and identities but to pacify unrestful Indigenous population. This is well represented in what one of the participants shared discussing how the local government reacts to dissatisfaction of Indigenous people with the current reforms and policies. They say: "this is what I give you, at least this is something" (#P1).

One major reason for multicultural reforms not being sensitive or relevant for Indigenous groups' needs and interests is the colonized mentality. Such mentality – informed by the conceptions and cultural references of the Chinese group – shapes and determines the development of institutions, educational content, and pedagogy. As the system is believed by the Indigenes to be inflexible and unwilling to undergo substantial changes, not only full multiculturalism but also critical multiculturalism cannot be achieved: the status quo is maintained and there may be no awareness that it needs to be questioned. As a result, Indigenous people are kept in a disadvantaged and marginalized position and prevented from attaining justice and equality.

Multicultural curriculum

One of the outcomes of the assimilationist approach with some elements of multiculturalism used in Taiwan is that curriculum (including content, textbook, and pedagogy) adopts the contributions approach, as conceptualized by Banks (1989). In the context of Taiwan it is limited to Indigenous people receiving one 40-minute lesson of Indigenous culture and language per week and showcasing Indigenous performative culture to the dominant group during school extra-curricular events. This approach is not efficient for reviving Indigenous cultures and languages, engineering a culturally

sensitive and relevant environment for Indigenous students, or addressing racism and discrimination they may experience from non-Indigenous people. The approach simply adds a course on Indigenous cultures and languages for some Indigenous people and a performance to enjoy for non-Indigenous people. It does not introduce essential Indigenous-friendly modifications into the curriculum and does not add discussions on diversity and Indigenous issues the additive approach would.

The problematic aspect of this approach to multiculturalism is not only that students do not learn to see their society from the perspectives of its diverse members, their histories and cultures, as Banks (1989) suggests. What this approach does to Indigenous people is it makes education for them largely meaningless and not healthy for building and strengthening Indigenous identities and cultures. It also makes it hard for them to progress academically as learning environments are structured around concepts, language, history representation, knowledge system, and other essential dimensions of the dominant group at the expense of Indigenous philosophies, knowledge systems, views of history, contributions to the society, and other aspects that would make education for Indigenous people relevant, sensitive, and welcoming.

At the same time, Indigenous children can observe that the knowledge, cultures, orientations, and language that are favoured belong to the dominant group, making them feel that whatever Indigenous world has to offer is worthless and irrelevant. As Fenelon and LeBeau (2006, p. 28) put it, when schools promote truth and knowledge of the dominant group as it is *the only* truth and knowledge, they “render all other ways of life/thought/feelings/embodiment as invalid.” Denying Indigenous world to enter mainstream schooling shows disrespect towards Indigenous belief systems, values, and contexts. This position – whether explicitly or implicitly – designs education strategies and policies that intend to assimilate Indigenous groups into the dominant culture.

Another concern for the curriculum is not only lack of cultural references and Indigenous knowledge(s) and philosophies, but limited representation and misrepresentation of Indigenous and Chinese groups in the curriculum. This representation is constructed and controlled by the dominant group that shapes the discourse on Indigenous people and issues and creates a particular image the Chinese group – and Indigenous people – have about the Indigenous world. As can be seen from the findings, the Indigenous discourse sees Indigenous cultures in a stereotypical and negative way which can reinforce the superiority of the dominant, Chinese group, and the need to assimilate Indigenous people.

Implications for Taiwan's multicultural education

Taiwan's multicultural education can be said to be a mix of assimilationism and elements of the multicultural stage of pluralism enacted in the education system through the contributions approach to multicultural curriculum reform. Based on the discussions with the Indigenous participants, it can be determined that such form of multiculturalism has not done and is not expected to do what the Indigenous people need for the revival of their communities. Positive and substantial changes can take place if multicultural policies adopt the approach of critical multiculturalism and the curriculum will be revised and modified to use decision-making and social action approach. After all, Zilliacus and colleagues (2017, p. 231) are right in saying that “narrow notions of what multicultural education is threaten the politically rooted movement for equity and social justice.” The goals that are pursued by Indigenous people in Taiwan and elsewhere.

If adopted, critical multiculturalism approach can help enforce the rejection of the status quo in the society and call on various parties to work towards justice and

equity for Indigenous communities. The revised model of education in this case will work to teach all students whether they are Indigenous or not to acquire skills to see the complex relations between histories, legacy, and development to understand the struggles and needs of different populations. Such educational approach will also work to dismantle unjust and oppressive structures that marginalize, silence, fetishize, and stereotype some groups, their cultures, perspectives, worldviews, and identities. Banks' decision-making and social action approach can aid this process through major transformations in the curriculum, including textbooks and pedagogies used by teachers, and teacher education itself. One lesson of Indigenous culture and language for Indigenous students per week therefore should transform to the inclusion of Indigenous philosophies, views, perspectives, histories, and other orientations into all school subjects.

However, changes in content, although fundamental and substantial, may not be enough to achieve justice and equality. Apart from learning about the Indigenous Other, their contribution, and colonization of their lands and destruction of their cultures that led to the current low socio-economic status, non-Indigenous students need to unlearn bias and racist stereotypes about Indigenous communities and be proactive in the work towards Indigenous justice and equality. Critical multicultural education is one such way as it aims to transform the perceptions of and attitudes towards the Other and consciously work to construct a new world that is just and equitable for all. It therefore should become part of the revision of multicultural policies and curriculum in Taiwan.

References

- Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education*. New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A. (1989). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. *Trotter Review*, 3(3), 17–19.

- Caldwell, E. (2018). Transitional justice legislation in Taiwan before and during the Tsai administration. *Washington International Law Journal*, 27(2).
- Cauquelin, J. (2011). *The aborigines of Taiwan. The Puyuma: From headhunting to the modern world* (2nd ed.). London/New York: Routledge.
- Chen, P. (2012). Empowering identity reconstruction of Indigenous college students through transformative learning. *Educational Review*, 64(2), 161–180. doi:10.1080/00131911.2011.592574
- Chen, S.-H. (2015). Promoting international education for Indigenous elementary schools in Taiwan: School principals' perspectives. *Asian Social Science*, 11(9). doi:10.5539/ass.v11n9p21
- Chen, S.-M., & Young, A. L. (2015). Dancing with ethnic identities: An aboriginal dance club in a Taiwanese middle school. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 17(2).
- Cheng, S. Y. (2004). *The politics of identity and schooling: A comparative case study of American Indians and Taiwan Aborigines (China)*. (PhD), University of California, Los Angeles. (AAT 3146619)
- Chi, C.-C. (2007). The ideas and ideals of First Nations and their applications in Taiwan: A critical evaluation. *Taiwan International Studies Quarterly*, 3(2), 1-22.
- Chi, C. C. (2012). *Indigenous movements and the making of multicultural Taiwan*. Taipei, Taiwan (R.O.C.): Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica.
- Chou, H.-M. (2005). *Educating urban Indigenous students in Taiwan: Six teachers' perspectives* (PhD thesis). University of Maryland, USA.
- Coca, N. (2013). Taiwan's culture revitalization efforts in action. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Language and Cultures*. Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Fenelon, J. V., & LeBeau D. (2006). Four directions for Indian education: Curriculum models for Lakota and Dakota teaching and learning. In I. Abu-Saad & D. Champagne (Eds.), *Indigenous education and empowerment: International perspectives* (pp. 21-68). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Friedman, P. K. (2018). The hegemony of the local: Taiwanese multiculturalism and Indigenous identity politics. *Boundary 2*, 45(3), 79-105. doi:10.1215/01903659-6915593
- Gao, P. (2001). *Minority, not minor*. Taipei, Taiwan (R.O.C.): Taiwan Today, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Giroux, H. (1995). Insurgent multiculturalism and the promise of pedagogy. In D. T. Goldberg (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: A critical reader* (pp. 325–343). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Gorski, P. (2016). Rethinking the role of "culture" in educational equity: From cultural competence to equity literacy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 18(4), 221-226. doi:10.1080/15210960.2016.1228344
- Hsieh, J. (2006). *Collective rights of Indigenous peoples: Identity-based movement of plain Indigenous in Taiwan*. New York/London: Routledge.

Huang, W.-D. (2007). *Indigenous students' negotiation of cultural differences: The construction of linguistic identities amongst Amis students in Taiwan*. Paper presented at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Institute of Education, University of London.

International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), The. (2019). *The Indigenous world 2019*. Copenhagen, Denmark: The Author.

Jackson, L. (2014a). *Muslims and Islam in U.S. education: Reconsidering multiculturalism*. London/New York: Routledge.

Jackson, L. (2014b). Under construction: The development of multicultural curriculum in Hong Kong and Taiwan. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 23(4), 885–893. doi:10.1007/s40299-014-0199-9

Kingsbury, B. (1998). "Indigenous peoples" in international law: A constructivist approach to the Asian controversy. In C. Erni (Ed.), *The concept of Indigenous peoples in Asia: A resource book* (pp. 103-158). Copenhagen/Chiang Mai: International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA)/Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact Foundation (AIPP).

Ku, K.-h. (2012). Rights to recognition: Minorities and Indigenous politics in emerging Taiwan nationalism. In D. Blundell (Ed.), *Taiwan since martial law: Society, culture, politics, economy* (pp. 91-129). Shung Ye Museum of Formosan Aborigines, the University of California, Berkley, & National Taiwan University Press.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). Lies my teacher still tells. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.), *Critical race perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum* (pp. 1–11). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Law, W.-W. (2002). Education reform in Taiwan: A search for a 'national' identity through democratisation and Taiwanisation. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 32(1), 61-81. doi:10.1080/03057920120116535

Lee, L., & Chen, P. (2014). Empowering Indigenous youth: Perspectives from a national service-learning program in Taiwan. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 5(3). doi:10.18584/iipj.2014.5.3.4

Mao, C.-J. (1997). Constructing a new social identity: Taiwan's curricular reforms of the nineties. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 6(4), 400-406.

Mason, R. (2009). Problematising multicultural art education in the context of Taiwan. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 39(4), 455-468. doi:10.1080/03057920802366364

May, S. (1999). Critical multiculturalism and cultural difference: Avoiding essentialism. In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist education* (pp. 11–41). Philadelphia/London: Falmer Press.

Morris, A. (2007). *Kanō baseball and 'triethnic' identity in 1930s Taiwan*. Paper presented at the Conference of the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California Berkeley.

Munsterhjelm, M. (2002). The First Nations of Taiwan: A special report on Taiwan's Indigenous peoples. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Lands, Resources, and Environments*. Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.

- Nesterova, Y. (2019). Teaching Indigenous children in Taiwan: Tensions, complexities, and opportunities. *Global Studies of Childhood*, 9(2), 156-166. doi:10.1177/2043619846349
- Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural education* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Nieto, S. (2005). Critical multicultural education and students' perspectives. In. S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and anti-racist education* (pp. 209–235). London: Falmer Press.
- Pawan, C. (2004). *Indigenous language education in Taiwan*. Paper presented at the 11th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Conference, University of California at Berkeley.
- Rudolph, M. (2016). The quest for ethnic reclassification in multiculturalist Taiwan: The case of the Sakizaya. *Archiv Orientalni*, 84(2), 413-443.
- Shih, C.-F. (2010). Academic colonialism and the struggle for Indigenous knowledge systems in Taiwan. *Social Alternatives*, 29(1), 44-47.
- Simon, S. (2002). The underside of a miracle: Industrialization, land, and Taiwan's Indigenous peoples. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Lands, Resources, and Environments*. Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.
- St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through multiculturalism: "There are other children here". *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and Cultural Studies*, 33(4), 306-317. doi:10.1080/10714413.2011.597638
- Su, Y.-C. (2006). Political ideology and Taiwanese school curricula. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 7(1), 41-50. doi:10.1007/BF03036783
- Su, Y.-C. (2007). Ideological representations of Taiwan's history: An analysis of elementary social studies textbooks, 1978–1995. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 37(3), 205-237. doi:10.1111/j.1467-873X.2007.00383.x
- Teng, E. J. (2004). *Taiwan's imagined geography: Chinese colonial travel writing and pictures, 1683-1895*. Cambridge (Massachusetts)/London: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Tsao, F.-f. (1997). Preserving Taiwan's Indigenous languages and cultures: A discussion in sociolinguistic perspective. *Globalization and Indigenous Culture*. Retrieved from <http://www2.kokugakuin.ac.jp/ijcc/wp/global/07tsao.html>
- Ukpokodu, O. (2003). Teaching multicultural education from a critical perspective: Challenges and dilemmas. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 5(4), 17–23.
- Wang, L.-j. (2004). Multiculturalism in Taiwan: Contradictions and challenges in cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(3), 301-318. doi:10.1080/1028663042000312534
- Yen, S.-H. (2009). Effective strategies for teaching Taiwanese minority students with low achievement and low socio-economic backgrounds. *Asia Pacific Education Review*, 10, 455–463. doi:10.1007/s12564-009-9053-9
- Zilliacus, H., Holm, G. & Sahlström, F. (2017). Taking steps towards institutionalising multicultural education: The national curriculum of Finland. *Multicultural Education Review*, 9(4), 231-248. doi:10.1080/2005615X.2017.1383810

**Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education Approaches to
Indigenous People's Education in Taiwan**

Yulia Nesterova

Faculty of Education, The University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong SAR

yulia.nesterova@hku.hk

Multiculturalism and Multicultural Education Approaches to Indigenous People's Education in Taiwan

Taiwan has cast multicultural policies as a remedy for inequalities and injustices its 16 Indigenous groups face. Such policies aim to revive Indigenous languages and cultures and create a more welcoming and inclusive environment in schools. Despite the fact that Indigenous people are expected to be primary beneficiaries of these policies, not much is known about how they have affected Indigenous students and communities, if at all. Relying on in-depth semi-structured interviews with 16 Indigenous participants, this paper explores whether the policies have accomplished or are on the way to accomplishing the goals set, as seen by Indigenous people. The findings show that the multicultural approach to education is still informed by assimilationist logic that expects Indigenous people to adjust to the culture and orientations of the dominant group, and as such, does not redress the existing injustices and inequalities.

Character count: 54,032

Introduction

Since 1624 the Indigenous people on the island that is now known as Taiwan saw the establishment of colonial settlements on their land from diverse outside powers ranging from European (Portuguese, Dutch, and Spanish) to Asian (Chinese and Japanese). During this period, Indigenous groups went through forceful relocation, military subjugation, and harsh assimilationist policies that intended to 'civilize' them (Cauquelin, 2011; Pawan, 2004). Enforcement of a new type of education was viewed as the primary force to rid Indigenous people of their 'savagery' by 'civilizing' them into the 'superior' identity, culture, language, and ethics of the new rulers (Teng, 2004). The 'civilizing' methods included uprooting of Austronesian cultures, languages, and identities of the Indigenous people and replacing them with those of the dominant, ruling group (Morris, 2007; Simon, 2002).

The process of 'civilization' through assimilation intensified during the Japanese colonial rule (1895-1945) and martial law under the Chinese Nationalist Party (1949-1987). Assimilation has led to gradual destruction of Indigenous lifestyles, traditional

1 structures, and communities, and erosion of Indigenous languages, knowledge systems,
2 identities, and cultures (Hsieh, 2006; Su, 2006). It has also pushed Indigenous people
3 from the place of being the masters of the island and their own fate to a minority
4 comprising only 2.39% of the population and having no control over their own
5 development or that of society's political, social, and economic domains (see Chi, 2012;
6 International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), 2019). Centuries of
7 domination and subjugation have brought economic and social marginalization and
8 fragmentation to Indigenous communities and created a stereotyped image of an
9 indolent, addictive, and illiterate 'Other' leading to discrimination against and low self-
10 esteem and self-respect among Indigenous people (Chen & Young, 2015; Yen, 2009).
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 As martial law was repealed in 1987, Taiwan started transition from
26 authoritarianism and repression of human and Indigenous rights and freedoms to
27 democratization and Taiwanization/localization of development (Cauquelin, 2011; Law,
28 2002). Two of the features of this transition were re-discovery of ethnic and linguistic
29 diversity of the island to establish a locally-rooted identity and culture for a cohesive
30 and harmonious nation-building, and removal of injustices that laid barriers to
31 Indigenous people's academic and socio-economic advancement. To aid this
32 transitional process, 'multicultural Taiwan' was chosen as the national identity and
33 strategy to work towards (Wang, 2004), and multicultural education – as a remedy to
34 the inequalities and injustices Indigenous people have been experiencing in academic
35 settings and beyond. This shift to multiculturalism was sustained by the development
36 and implementation of new educational policies and standards including the *Indigenous*
37 *Education Act* that was introduced in 1998 to improve Indigenous people's experiences
38 and outcomes in mainstream educational institutions (Nesterova, 2019).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Based on a qualitative study across Taiwan's regions, this paper discusses whether multiculturalism in its current conceptualization and implementation in Taiwan has been responding to the complex and multifaceted matters experienced by the most disadvantaged group in the society – Indigenous people. The paper starts by introducing Taiwan's Indigenous people, their geographical, social, and cultural make-up and moves to explore the conceptions of Taiwan's multiculturalism(s) promoted by the two parties that have governed Taiwan since 1987 – Kuomintang/the Chinese Nationalist Party (henceforth, KMT) and the Democratic Progressive Party (henceforth, DPP) and their implementation in mainstream education system. After that, it presents Indigenous voices that examine and reflect on these multicultural ideas, policies, and practices to determine how effectively (or not) they work towards the set goals of revival of Indigenous identities and cultures and addressing injustices and inequalities Indigenous people face. The paper concludes by highlighting implications for multicultural education for Indigenous and non-Indigenous people in Taiwan and beyond.

Indigenous people of Taiwan

As a multi-lingual and multi-cultural society, Taiwan hosts such major ethnic groups as Han Chinese (divided into Hakka, Waisheng or mainland Chinese, and Minnan) and the Indigenous people. While the Han Chinese settlers started moving to Taiwan in the 17th centuries, the exact date of Indigenous people's settlement on the island is not known. Nevertheless, archaeological records show that already in 300 AD Austronesians sailed from Taiwan to the Philippines and other parts of the world, influencing languages and cultures of the Maori, Indonesians, Hawaiians, and others (Coca, 2013).

The Indigenous people are further divided into 16 officially recognized groups and at least 9 groups referred to as *ping pu* who are seeking state-level recognition. The recognized groups comprise approximately 565,043 people, or 2.39% of the population of the island (IWGIA, 2019). While they all belong to the Austronesian family and have a shared history of colonization and assimilation, they differ in size, inhabit different areas across the island, and exhibit differences in their socio-cultural organization (see Table 1). After centuries of colonization by outside powers, the main concerns the Indigenous people grapple with include disappearing cultures and languages, low socio-economic status, and limited political and economic influence (IWGIA, 2019).

Table 1. Recognized Indigenous Groups: Demographics, Locations, Characteristics

No	Name	Population	Location	Characteristics
1	Amis	177,000	Hualien and Taitung	Matrilineal system of social organization: female leadership of the private sphere (including property ownership), male leadership of the public sphere (laws, tribal politics, and others).
2	Paiwan	86,000	Sandimen and Taitung	The chief should be of the noble class. The chief acts as the leader in politics, military, and religion.
3	Atayal	81,000	New Taipei, Hualien, Hsinchu, Nantou	Facial tattoos are a long-standing tradition. Ancestral worship rituals are the key social/religious activity. Red clothes are favored as it represents blood that drives evil spirits away.
4	Bunun	50,000	Nantou, Kaohsiung, Eastern Taiwan	Patriarchal social structure; family members may include non-family blood relation; schedule their ceremonies according to millet planting, weeding, and harvest.
5	Truku	24,000	Taroko Gorge	Were at the forefront fighting the Japanese invasion; still keep their traditional technique of shaman sorcery and worship ancestors in special ceremonies every year.

6	Puyuma	11,000	Taitung	Divided into 8 sub-tribes that have different mythology about their creation; have 2 traditional systems of social organization: 1. family system with inheritance by the eldest daughter, and 2. organized by the different ages of men.
7	Rukai	11,600	Taitung and Wutai	Traditional social structure is comprised of commoners and nobles; with the latter have more economic and land privileged; commoners can be elevated to nobility through leadership and harvest production.
8	Sediq	10,000	Nantou	Traditional religion is based on 'utux', which means 'ancestral spirits'. Disrespecting utux brings disaster and misfortune. The group has the mosy conscious living, worships Sisin, the sacred bird, and makes decisions based on the sound the bord makes.
9	Tsou	6,500	Alishan	Very strict patriarchal structure; the social and political organization includes small and large well-organized clans; all decisions are made by men. Major ceremonies include war ritual and ancestral spirit worship.
10	Saisiyat	5,300	Hsinchu and Miaoli	Patriarchal structure of the tribe with women having no authority and inheritance rights for men only; consists of a number of sub-tribes that have equal status in relation to each other.
11	Dao	3,500	Orchid Island	Live offshore, isolated from the other groups, as a result, culture is relatively intact; social affairs are run by male heads of households and community's fishing groups. Famous for traditional boats, female hair dances.
12	Kavalan	1,100	Hualien and Yilan	The group believes that each living and non-living creature has its own spirit; has special offering ceremony and healing ceremony performed by a female shaman.

13	Thao	648	Sun Moon Lake	Patriarchal society; tribal chief, the position is inherited by the eldest son, is the main decision maker. The group was strongly influenced by the Chinese, but still holds to its traditions, one of them is having a basket with ancestor spirit at home.
14	Kanakanavu	520	Kaohsiung	Patrilineal society; has ceremonies to express gratitude for millet that is part of their daily diet and to the river for fish and other resources.
15	Hlaaula	400	Kaohsiung	Currently 3 main communities that are led by individual hereditary leaders and an assembly of elders and chiefs that make decisions about public affairs.
16	Sakizaya	335	Hualien (among Amis people)	Matrilineal system, a man moves to his wife's house after marriage. Fishing and hunting are traditional ways of life. 'Miamavaki' is the ceremony in which elders give regards to young group members.

Multicultural education

In this work, multicultural education is defined as “education that aims to respond to the presence of diversity and inequality in society” (Jackson, 2014a, p. 12). It does so by defining the overall approach to education that further influences curriculum development and other related practices. Jackson (2014a) differentiates between assimilationist and pluralist approaches to multiculturalism. Assimilationist approach sees differences between groups as deficiencies and barriers to equality and social progress. Minority groups are expected to abandon their cultural practices and orientations and adjust to those of the dominant group. Education then plays a role of the initiator of these disadvantaged groups into the values, mannerism, and practices of the broader society.

Jackson (2014a) contrasts assimilationism with pluralist approach which she divides into multiculturalism and critical multiculturalism. The former views cultural and social difference as good and worthy of public recognition and toleration and posits that dismissing diverse cultural representations and references harm minorities, their self-esteem and identity. The latter rejects the status quo that keeps minorities in an inferior and disadvantaged position and calls it unjust and unethical. Education through multicultural lens looks to preserve diverse cultures and teach their members to live peacefully together, whereas critical multicultural education also works to dismantle oppressive structures that disadvantage and marginalize minority groups.

In school contexts, critical multiculturalism does so by self-consciously and critically assessing, challenging, and rejecting racism, discrimination, and unequal power dynamics in policies and practices and their negative impact on marginalized and vulnerable students (Nieto, 2005). Schools that adopt critical multiculturalism as its philosophy, first, affirm pluralism represented by their staff, students, and their communities and incorporate diverse knowledges, histories, and value systems into a teaching-learning paradigm in an ethical and responsible manner (see May, 1999; Nieto, 2000). Second, they emphasize a proactive and conscious engagement with issues of social justice to transform “the diverse histories, cultural narratives, representations, and institutions that produce racism and other forms of discrimination” (Giroux, 1995, p. 328) and construct just, equitable, “culturally responsive and responsible practice[s]” (Ukpokodu, 2003, p. 19).

As far as multicultural curriculum is concerned, Banks (1989) proposes four types. Contributions type keeps curriculum structure and goals unchanged while focusing on integrating certain ethnic and cultural references such as ethnic heroes, food, music, and dance on specific days. This approach is the easiest for teachers to

adopt, but it teaches nothing about ethnic groups and tends to “gloss over important concepts and issues related to the victimization and oppression of ethnic groups and their struggles against racism and for power” (Banks, 1989, p. 17).

Additive type adds to the existing curriculum some selected literature, units or courses that discuss topics related to ethnic and cultural diversity issues. While there is a certain addition in this type, no fundamental changes are made in the curriculum, and content is chosen by the dominant group to comply with criteria and perspectives of the mainstream society. This approach fails to equip students with skills to see their society from differing perspectives and to understand connections between histories and cultures of diverse groups. As Ladson-Billings (2003) explains, this approach leaves the “monocultural, exclusive narrative” unchallenged (p. 9).

Transformation type sets to change basic assumptions in the curriculum. Similar to critical multiculturalism, it integrates diverse concepts, problems, perspectives, and references to make students look at different issues and events from differing worldviews and points of view. Curriculum undergoes fundamental changes to integrate a variety of (divergent) perspectives, meanings, and content to fully understand the complexity of their society. Finally, decision-making and social action type is an enhanced transformation type as it also aims to equip students with such skills as research skills, political efficacy, critical thinking, and critical decision-making and action.

Multicultural education and Indigenous people in Taiwan

Despite being the authoritarian ruler that established martial law in 1949, the KMT was the party that – though under immense pressure – initiated and carried through the transition to democracy, remaining the principal power until 2000 when Chen Shui-bian

1 of the DPP became the president of Taiwan (Caldwell, 2018). KMT won presidential
2 elections in 2008 and remained in power until 2016 when another DPP's choice, a
3 woman politician with Indigenous ancestry, Tsai Ing-wen was elected president. It is
4 these two parties' politics that have been shaping multiculturalism and multicultural
5 education that affected Indigenous education in Taiwan in the democratic period: KMT
6 from 1987 to 2000 and from 2008 to 2016 and DPP from 2000 to 2008 and from 2016
7 until now.

18 For both parties, multiculturalism acted as a way to address two acute matters
19 facing the society in transition to democracy. One was formation of a new identity of
20 Taiwan's citizens and the other – finding remedies for inequalities and injustices
21 experienced by Indigenous and other minority groups (Cheng, 2004; Ku, 2012). If the
22 views on identity formation have seen certain fundamental differences between the
23 parties due to their political and geopolitical directions (especially relationships and ties
24 with Mainland China), their approaches to addressing inequalities Indigenous groups
25 experience have been much the same.

39 KMT multiculturalism started as a response to the need to deconstruct the
40 coercively imposed uniform and nationalist Chinese identity and build a new identity to
41 reflect the society's multicultural heritage and liberal democratic values in post-
42 authoritarian era (Jackson, 2014b). The KMT model of multiculturalism is hierarchal as
43 it places the dominant Chinese culture on top followed by all the other island's minority
44 cultures (e.g., Indigenous, Hakka). This approach was best described by the former
45 president Lee Teng Hui of the KMT party who, talking about the Indigenous population
46 of Taiwan, said that they "have to 'melt' into Taiwanese society" without which they
47 "cannot exist" (Wang, 2004, p. 307).

1 Critics of KMT multiculturalism suggest that highlighting Indigenous and
2 minority cultures as part of multicultural Taiwan and its multicultural education was a
3 way to form a new nationalism (Wang, 2004) and to pacify “an unrestful Taiwan
4 population” (Mao, 1997, p. 404). Indigenous cultures were not viewed as worthy to
5 survive in their entirety and standing on their own, without integration into the
6 dominant Chinese structure. Efforts were therefore directed at preserving the parts of it
7 and addressing the needs of Indigenous people that could be tolerated in the mainstream
8 sinocentric society and education (Mao, 1997).
9

10 KMT has taken a series of actions to enact their model of multicultural Taiwan.
11 The first action was the 1992 amendment of the Constitution to pledge assistance to
12 Indigenous cultural and language revival. The amendment intended to allocate funding
13 and other support to promote and teach Indigenous languages and cultures and conduct
14 research on Indigenous issues. As Tsao (1997) shows, only a small number of intended
15 activities were even started or completed, and most of them were too impractical, small-
16 scale, and in some cases too late to be able to address the urgent issues Indigenous
17 communities faced (e.g., language and knowledge loss and structural injustices).
18

19 In 1996 the Commission on Education Reform implemented a new educational
20 policy referred to as ‘dual cultural identities’ attempting to aid the revival of Indigenous
21 identities (Huang, 2007). The policy failed to produce positive results as Indigenous
22 children were still educated in predominantly Chinese environment. Such education
23 distressed their Indigenous identities and mother tongue skills as Mandarin was used as
24 the only language of instruction while Indigenous languages were labelled as “informal,
25 useless, playful, traditional and backward” (Huang, 2007, p. 16). The consequence of
26 this treatment of Indigenous languages was their continued destruction: the 2004 survey
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 showed that only 9% of Indigenous children could speak their respective Indigenous
2 mother tongues (Pawan, 2004). Despite that, KMT-led multicultural reforms in 1990s,
3 including that of the introduction of the *Twelve Education Reform Mandates* in 1998 led
4 to a more integrated multicultural curriculum that focused on diversity, local issues,
5 respect and protection of diverse cultures, and prevention of prejudice and
6 discrimination (Jackson, 2014b).
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

16 Another key measure taken by KMT in support of Indigenous development, for
17 example, includes recognizing Indigenous groups as Indigenous or *yuan-chu-min* 原住
18 民族 in Chinese (“original people’s group”) through amendments in the Constitution in
19 1994 (Kingsbury, 1998). This move gave them – at least on paper – powers and rights
20 to control their development and receive support to carry required changes through.
21 Introduction of the *Education Act for Indigenous Peoples* in 1998 (amended in 2015)
22 was another positive development that gave Indigenous communities the right to
23 establish their own educational spaces and structures, promote Indigenous languages,
24 history, and culture in mainstream institutions, and ensure that discrimination, racism,
25 and misrepresentation are addressed. Initiatives that emerged ensured access for
26 Indigenous children to quality schools (Cheng, 2004) and additional points for passing
27 the National Proficiency Test of Aboriginal Languages (PTAL) to be admitted to
28 tertiary institutions (Rudolph, 2016). Yet, the schools that serve Indigenous students,
29 still tend to lack adequate funding, resources, facilities, and qualified teachers (Chou,
30 2005; Nesterova, 2019).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 DPP’s need for multiculturalism, especially with the focus on legitimizing
55 Indigenous identities, stemmed from the political necessity to ensure sovereignty from
56 Mainland China (Ku, 2012). As a result, it has led to a slightly different model of
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 multiculturalism that prioritizes the so-called localized Taiwanese culture followed in
2 the hierarchy by Chinese and then global cultures (including Japanese, Western, and
3 migrant workers from other Asian states). The Taiwanese culture in this case is a
4 merger of diverse cultures that developed on the island prior to martial law. It thus
5 incorporates the cultures of Hoklo and Hakka people (Chinese people who started
6 settling in Taiwan in the 17th century) and those of Indigenous people that belong to the
7 Austronesian family (Wang, 2004).
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 The DPP model was put forward by president Chen Shui-bian who envisioned a
19 mosaic of cultures that would live peacefully with each other to create, what he called, a
20 harmonious symphony (Wang, 2004). Despite the theoretical shift from a hierarchy to
21 mosaic of cultures and a more substantial acknowledgement of Indigenous identities in
22 shaping the local culture and identity, Chen's idea was hardly widely accepted.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
Indigenous cultures are still seen as comprising an insignificant part of the local
Taiwanese culture (2.39% of the population as opposed to approximately 70% of the
Hoklo people of Chinese ancestry) and as a consequence were in need to melt into the
Taiwanese identity. Nevertheless, president Chen officially announced in 2001 that
multiculturalism would be the national policy to help reaffirm democracy (Law, 2002)
and identity of Taiwanese people (Mason, 2009). In relation to Indigenous people, in
1999 Chen's administration developed a "New Partnership" agreement to aid work on
Indigenous autonomy and related powers (Chi, 2007). A positive development of this
decision has been the change from treating the Indigenes as a monolithic and
homogenous ethnic group to treating them as individual groups (Rudolph, 2016).

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
21

1 academic underachievement of Indigenous students. In different periods it was
2 determined by Taiwan-based studies that Indigenous children do not succeed
3 academically in mainstream educational institutions due to their cultural differences
4 from the mainstream (see Lee & Chen, 2014; S.-H. Chen, 2015; P. Chen, 2012; Huang,
5 2007). Indigenous cultural difference has been seen as cultural deficiency that prevented
6 Indigenous children from adjusting to the learning environment and academic
7 expectations of Taiwan's schooling.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18 The remedy that would correct such problematic experiences was found in
19 multicultural education that was executed in educational institutions in the form of
20 introduction of performative Indigenous cultures. Multicultural education then became
21 restricted to what Taiwan's scholars refer to as "artsy" (Wang, 2014) and "touristy"
22 (Chou, 2005) practices. Chi (2012, p. 3) pointed out that such practices manifest in "the
23 celebration of distinct cultural expressions and performances." Such decisions are made
24 due to the superficial understanding of multiculturalism (Fenelon & LeBeau, 2006), the
25 needs of Indigenous people, and the stereotypical image of Indigenous groups as people
26 who lead "carefree lives singing and dancing" (Gao, 2001).
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Chou (2005) blamed this on ethnic and racial blindness of Taiwan's
42 multicultural policies. The studies conducted by Cheng (2004) and Yen (2009) also
43 determined that it is racist attitudes of non-Indigenous teachers who lack knowledge
44 about Indigenous people and skills to engage with them and instead, stereotype and
45 discriminate against Indigenous people, their cultures and identities. The danger is not
46 only that such unhealthy environment in schools leads to lack of motivation to study on
47 behalf of Indigenous children. This focus on artistic expression of Indigenous groups,
48 lack of accurate and comprehensive representation of them in the classroom, and
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 unwillingness to address racism perpetuate stereotypes and prejudices about Indigenous
2 people and their lifestyles (Su, 2006; 2007) and diminish the complexity and
3
4 intersectionality of their identities (Gorski, 2016) to dance, song, and ‘costume’.
5
6
7

8 The focus on artistic and touristy components of Indigenous cultures can be a
9
10 consequence not purely of misunderstanding of multiculturalism, but of intentional
11
12 pursuit of economic benefits from the ‘exotic’ cultures of Indigenous people. The
13
14 Austronesian identity of the Indigenes has been used as backdoor diplomacy to establish
15
16 neo-liberal free trade contracts with countries with Austronesian population in the
17
18 Pacific (Friedman, 2018) and to sign memorandums of understanding with Canada and
19
20 Australia which certainly resulted in benefits of intercultural exchange between
21
22 Indigenous people of Taiwan, Canada, and Australia (Munsterhjelm, 2002). Locally, the
23
24 stereotypical identity of a joyous, dancing, and singing Indigene has been recreated to
25
26 promote tourism within Taiwan and to showcase Indigenous people at national events
27
28 (Munsterhjelm, 2002) to solidify a localized Taiwanese identity. To accomplish this,
29
30 Indigenous people are expected to be more authentic than authentic to be attractive to
31
32 the outsiders. This condition fractures Indigenous communities and hampers the
33
34 development of strong Indigenous identities and cultures effectively forcing the
35
36 Indigenes to focus on “local authenticity at the expense of other forms of legitimacy”
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45 (Friedman, 2018, p. 97).
46
47

48 It should be admitted that the KMT and DPP multicultural policies and practices
49
50 have opened up possibilities of revival of Indigenous cultures and search for identities.
51
52 As Jackson’s (2014b) analysis of Taiwan’s curriculum suggests, education *has* become
53
54 less assimilationist and more multicultural. Nevertheless, neither parties have managed
55
56 to respond to these needs in a more profound manner nor have they been able to address
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 more structural and complex matters hampering Indigenous development (Shih, 2010).
2 The focus on Indigenous artistic performances alone conceals a more urgent need in
3
4 developing Indigenous communities – the need to not only revive Indigenous
5
6 worldviews, knowledge systems, and philosophies, but to address racial and socio-
7
8 economic inequalities and injustices (St. Denis, 2011).
9
10

11 **Materials and methods**

12
13
14
15
16
17 This study is a part of a larger qualitative research project on the development of
18
19 Indigenous education conducted in Taiwan. The qualitative research design was
20
21 selected as the aim of the project was to understand the “phenomenon from the views of
22
23 the participants” (Creswell, 2009, p. 16). Apart from that, a qualitative inquiry allowed
24
25 to establish close contacts with the participants to develop trust and rapport which
26
27 helped them to open up and be willing to let the researcher to come for any
28
29 clarifications and additional information. The use of interviews also enabled more
30
31 comprehensive discussions about the matter under study as the participants spent
32
33 extended periods of time with the researcher.
34
35
36
37

38
39 The data were collected during a fieldwork across Taiwan in August 2016.
40
41 Sixteen Indigenous people participated in in-depth semi-structured interviews
42
43 evaluating and reflecting on the education policies implemented during 1990s and
44
45 2000s. The participants included six Taiwan’s Indigenous leaders (IL) and ten
46
47 professors (P) all of whom work to assist Indigenous communities’ development and
48
49 promotion of Indigenous cultures, knowledge, and education (see Table 2). They came
50
51 from diverse Indigenous groups (e.g., Amis, Bunun, Puyuma, Paiwan, and others) in
52
53 which they were considered as respected and trusted leaders by their people. All
54
55 participants were all above the age of 35 to ensure that in their interviews they could
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

rely on their substantial experience (at least 10 years) in Indigenous affairs and understanding of the complexities and factors of Indigenous development within the local and global contexts.

Table 2. Profiles of interview participants

Participant	Location	Primary Fields of Expertise
P1	Taichung	Professor: Indigenous education, Indigenous language, Indigenous culture
P2	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous and minority languages and education, multiculturalism
P3	Hualien	Professor: Indigenous rights, justice, land rights, political science and law
P4	Tainan	Professor: Indigenous knowledge, Higher Education
P5	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous rural education, cultural revival
P6	Taichung	Professor: Justice, Indigenous rights, Indigenous economic development
P7	Taichung	Professor: Indigenous development, cultural revival
P8	Taitung	Professor: Indigenous language education, urban indigenous communities
P9	Hualien	Professor: Indigenous grassroots political movement, Indigenous education, Indigenous language
P10	Tainan	Professor: Indigenous education, Indigenous languages
IL1	Taichung	Indigenous education, cultural revival
IL2	Taitung	Indigenous rights, Indigenous governance, cooperation between and among groups
IL3	Taitung	Indigenous rights, cultural revival
IL4	Hualien	Indigenous rights, grassroots movement for education, language and cultural revival
IL5	Hualien	Rural indigenous development, environmental sustainability
IL6	Hualien	Immersion schools for indigenous children, rural development

1 As the participants live across Taiwan – from the western and more developed
2 cities of Taichung and Tainan where Indigenous people were affected by colonization
3 most to the eastern part of Hualien and Taitung where the mountains provided a barrier
4 that kept the colonial powers away for a much longer period of time – the interviews
5 took place in these four cities and counties. Each interview lasted from one hour to two
6 hours and a half. The interviews were conducted in English except for one that required
7 Chinese-English interpreters and two others that asked for an interpreter to be present in
8 case they would have difficulty in expressing themselves. The interpreters were two
9 Indigenous women with full proficiency in the languages of the study and accepted
10 members in the Indigenous communities the participant came from. All the interviews
11 were audio-recorded with the written consent of the participants after the aim of the
12 study, its procedure, potential benefits and consequences had been discussed in detail.
13 After that, each interview was transcribed verbatim in English, and in the case of the
14 interviews conducted (partly or fully) in Chinese, Chinese and English transcriptions
15 were done and cross-checked by another interpreter fluent in two languages.

16 To analyze the data, cross-sectional and case studies approach were used. The
17 cross-sectional method consisted of identifying common themes, categories, and
18 patterns and after that merging the participants' responses under them, comparing and
19 contrasting their views and insights. Then, each participant's story was approached as
20 an individual case to tell a distinct story or narrative about the topic of the study.

21 **Results**

22 *Two distinctive policies*

23 Discussing Taiwan's multicultural policies, all participants agreed that Indigenous
24 people should not side with either of the two leading parties as no party prioritizes

1 Indigenous needs. Despite that, they all shared that if they compare how Indigenous
2 people have been treated by KMT and DPP during the democratization period, they
3 referred to KMT policies as “assimilationist” and “welfare colonialis[t]” whereas DPP
4 is viewed as a more “localized” and “Indigenized” party capable of more profound
5 multicultural reforms. As an Indigenous leader (#IL6) recounted:
6
7
8
9
10

11
12 There is a very long history for the KMT as a ruling party. ... their main policy -
13 we can call it colonizing, assimilation. So, it is hardly you can hear during their
14 regime that the so-called multiculturalism or even the respect Indigenous
15 traditional culture and knowledge, the language... and revitalize it, it's very
16 hard. But the more Indigenized and localized the party DPP, it is very ... On the
17 contrary, they want to be with the Indigenous people, and they have to
18 understand that they somehow have the same fate with the Indigenous people.
19
20

21 *Inequality in resources and representation in education*

22
23 Nevertheless, the participants were united in saying that the existing multicultural
24 policies – whether they were issued by KMT or DPP – are not sufficient for creating a
25 multicultural society. The reason is that the authorities and institutions do not pay due
26 attention to the revival of Indigenous cultures, languages, and knowledge(s),
27 strengthening of Indigenous identities, or dealing with academic underachievement,
28 low socio-economic status, and discrimination against Indigenous people. This lack of
29 real engagement with Indigenous issues on behalf of the authorities is a major concern
30 Indigenous people have regarding their own development. As they shared, since the
31 establishment of the quasi-ministerial Council of Indigenous Peoples (CIP) in 1996, the
32 responsibility to manage Indigenous education has been placed on this institution that
33 is often under-funded and lacks power similar to the Ministry of Education (MOE), for
34 example. As a professor (#P5) explained:
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 Even if they think they are doing multiculturalism. But I don't buy it. Because
55 they don't really think about how this Indigenous peoples' education, to
56 revitalize our language. They think that it's business of CIP, not the
57 government. ... And, actually, one of the problems related to Indigenous
58 education is that MOE they take control of general education, and CIP need to
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 deal with Indigenous education. Sometimes if you want to do something for
2 Indigenous education, there is a problem with this two. MOE is higher status
3 than CIP, they have more money.

4 Despite the responsibility being placed on CIP, the institution does not only
5
6 have limited finances or power, it has no control over mainstream education the vast
7
8 majority of Indigenous and non-Indigenous students attend. Schools are managed by
9
10 MOE that determines the structure, content, pedagogy, and other academic matters. As
11
12 it was noted by the participants, all the decisions are informed by the dominant Chinese
13
14 conceptions of education and societal success, and this is also reflected in the
15
16 educational approach and the teaching contents and pedagogy that are the same for
17
18 Indigenous and non-Indigenous students. In terms of the multicultural educational
19
20 approach, a professor (#P8) observed:
21
22
23
24

25
26 There is something like culture plus approach. Where basically you have the
27 mainstream culture and then you add on a few days, classes a week to learn
28 about each local culture.
29

30 The culture plus approach also includes adding cultural events where Indigenous
31
32 people are asked to wear traditional clothing and perform traditional songs and dances
33
34 to parents of non-Indigenous students. Apart from being viewed as exploitative and
35
36 superficial, the participants said that this approach to education, teaching, and content:
37
38
39

40
41 ... is not fair. You cannot teach every child the same thing, the same cultures,
42 the same languages. Because children are from different background. How can
43 you do that? We call that 'assimilationist policies' (#P1).
44

45 *Languages and education*

46
47
48 Language policy and language use are two other areas that shows the "failure" of the
49
50 multicultural approach. Reflecting on the language policy, a professor (#P1) stated that:
51
52

53
54 The government might say they are using the multiculturalism policy for
55 Indigenous peoples, but I don't think so. They provided us with a language
56 policy and language lessons in early childhood education. In pre-school it is
57 one class once a week. It is lesser than learning English. English, I believe, it's
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

two hours per week. You can see the difference. And the government will tell you, this is what I give you, at least this is something. But this is not enough.

It was explained by the others that each lesson of an Indigenous language lasts only 40 minutes, and it may not take place every week as such “insignificant classes” get cancelled in favour of math test or a sports event. Additionally, although it is a 40-minute class, there are only around 15 minutes of the actual language lesson because a teacher can sing or read something in an Indigenous language, but all explanations come in Mandarin. Such an arrangement makes it hard to master a language.

Another professor (#P7) shared:

It doesn't matter where you go, Mandarin is everywhere. Chinese culture, conceptions are everywhere. And even at home we can't learn about our culture and our language, as our people don't speak this language.

The issue, however, is not only with the loss of Indigenous languages and related knowledge as there is no space to learn and practice them. What worries the participants is that education in Chinese environment with the Chinese language, culture, and knowledge system, makes it challenging for Indigenous students to find meaning, belonging, and identity in the education they receive thus complicating their adjustment to the system and understanding of the material. As one Indigenous leader (#IL6) explained, echoing the other participants, “... for Indigenous people, it is difficult to learn their system, we need to overcome these difficulties that come from language and culture.”

Inequity of educational opportunity

As most of the participants expressed the difficulty stems from the policies being “simply not fair” as they do not have equal educational opportunity. By educational opportunity these participants do not mean educational access because access is ensured by law. What they focus on instead is a form of multiculturalism sensitive to Indigenous needs: one that acknowledges their languages, cultures, identities, traditions, histories, and lifestyles. As participants concluded, they are provided with equal access to good schools. The problem, however, is that many Indigenous students drop out of these schools that are not trained nor willing to deal with Indigeneity.

Unsatisfactory content of education

Dropping out of school and unsatisfactory academic achievements of those who finish schools are also a result of insensitive content of education which slows down their progress and/or makes the environment unbearable. The participants shared that the content represents Indigenous people as “barbarians” willing to assimilate to a civilized culture of the settlers. For this, textbooks use stories to promote a particular narrative. For example, a professor (#P1) stated that:

The textbook doesn’t talk about the contribution of Indigenous people. They talk only a little bit about Indigenous peoples. And they bring stereotypical image of Indigenous people.

All the participants agreed that the history of colonization of the island has been ignored. Instead, Chinese people are presented as pioneers on the quest to civilize barbarian and primitive Indigenous people. They said:

They talk about colonialism in a positive way. They say pioneering of Indigenous land. They try to say that barbarians were civilized. They still say that. They still think that we are primitive (#P1).

As a result, the participants argued, children may be afraid to share that they are Indigenous as some non-Indigenous people “still would joke about that word ‘barbarian’” (#IL4) and share degrading stories of Indigenous “savage cultures” (#P5). Such a view of Indigenous people as being uncivilized and barbarian, it was retorted, leads to discrimination and racist attacks and treatment by non-Indigenous people.

Learning about Indigeneity in schools

What is of concern is that education about Indigenous people is not part of the curriculum in Taiwan. This has created a situation when Indigenous people know everything about the dominant group and non-Indigenous people have no or limited knowledge about Indigenous people and their – in parts oppressive – history with the Chinese majority group. Very often such knowledge is based on stereotypes and misrepresentation which creates resentment on the part of Indigenous people. Some participants shared that “they [the dominant Chinese group] learn little about us” (#P2)

1 and “they don’t want to know anything” (#P7). The result, the Indigenous participants
2 said, is that there is no understanding by non-Indigenous people of what changes are
3 required to address the struggles of Indigenous people in the mainstream society and
4 education system. Most of them reflected that the dominant group does not know about
5 the reality Indigenous people live in and mostly sees them through a negative lens.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 They think we are not good people, we are inferior, and they have to help us.
13 ... They stigmatize us, and we stigmatize ourselves. It’s psychological, very
14 negative influence (#IL6).
15

16 Such lack of knowledge and understanding by the dominant group is not viewed
17 in society as problematic despite the fact that institutions, including the MOE, deal with
18 Indigenous affairs with no comprehensive understanding of Indigenous contexts and
19 needs. As it was mentioned by 15 participants, non-Indigenous institutions are unwilling
20 to get to know and understand Indigenous people, their affairs and values, and, thus are
21 not able to do much to help Indigenous communities. One professor (#P1) maintained
22 that:
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33
34 MOE does have a unit that deals with Indigenous education. It is small. In that
35 unit they don’t understand Indigenous education. That unit need to have more
36 people who are familiar with Indigenous education, language, culture.
37
38

39 *Colonization of Indigenous mind*

40
41

42 Lack of knowledge about Indigenous cultures, affairs, and related matters
43 among the dominant group representatives and institutions is not the only worry. The
44 real problem, repeated by everyone in the study, is that the Indigenous mind is
45 colonized and is overreliant on the dominant structures and mentality. An Indigenous
46 leader (#IL6) put it neatly:
47
48
49
50
51

52 We are double-blind. One blind for our knowledge, the other for theirs. We
53 don’t have the opportunity, time, or space to learn our ways, ourselves.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Multicultural education, therefore, for them would mean not only the dominant
2 society learning about Indigenous history and heritage as well as colonial legacy that
3
4 has affected them. It should also include Indigenous people learning about themselves,
5
6 recognizing and respecting their cultures, re-building and strengthening their identities,
7
8 and reviving and maintaining their cultures, languages, and traditions.
9

10 11 12 ***Uniqueness of Indigeneity*** 13

14
15 In addition, it was emphasized throughout the interviews, multiculturalism in
16
17 Taiwan cannot be developed with the benefit for Indigenous people if the “uniqueness
18
19 and value of each group” (#IL3) is not recognized. In relation to education, the
20
21 participants shared, this concerns the difference of mentalities, values, knowledges,
22
23 languages, and identities Indigenous and non-Indigenous people have. Multiculturalism
24
25 in the view of these participants should mean development of “each group in its own
26
27 unique cultural way while developing together at the same time by working as a team”
28
29 (#P4). This way, Indigenous participants believe, multicultural Taiwan will be possible.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 **Discussion**

37 38 ***Multicultural approach*** 39 40 41

42 Looking at the construction of multiculturalism in Taiwan, we can see some
43
44 progression of Taiwan’s multicultural education in the past few decades. The dominant
45
46 rhetoric has shifted from seeing the dominant Chinese culture as superior and those of
47
48 Indigenous people as barbarian and uncivilized (assimilationism) to acknowledging the
49
50 existence of Indigenous cultures and seeing their contribution, although restricted to
51
52 certain expressions and monitored (and disciplined?) by the dominant group, as
53
54 valuable (pluralism: multiculturalism).
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 The approach is, however, still mixed and informed more by assimilationism
2 than multiculturalism. Taiwan's Indigenes are still expected to adjust to the culture and
3 orientations of the dominant group when in the public sphere, not revive and expand
4 their own, Indigenous cultural references. Their presence, cultures, and identities are
5 tolerated and even praised by the wider society for their artistic performances that
6 contribute to visible diversity, construction of counter-Mainland Chinese identity, and
7 the economic domain through tourism.
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17 Multicultural education policies aim to preserve Indigenous cultures allegedly to
18 benefit Indigenous people. However, preservation concerns only some tolerable
19 Indigenous characteristics such as dance, song, and costume for someone else's
20 entertainment and monetary benefit while putting Indigenous cultures and identities in a
21 box where they cannot develop, change, and adjust for fear of not being seen
22 'authentic'. That which does not fit within the boundaries of the dominant epistemology
23 and ontology and which cannot therefore be tolerated should then be "domesticated" or
24 "made similar," as Andreotti (2011) explains.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 Another example that showcases assimilationism of Taiwan's multiculturalism
37 is the establishment of a semi-efficient under-funded Indigenous government in the
38 form of CIP that is charged with dealing with Indigenous issues that the dominant
39 institutions (including MOE and mainstream schools) do not take on. This shows that
40 Indigenous matters are pushed into its own domain that does not intersect or work
41 substantially with the public domain that is led and shaped by the dominant group with
42 little, if any, contribution by the Indigenes. As a result, multicultural policies that are
43 expected to benefit Indigenous communities, have done little for them.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 Another problematic side of Taiwan's multiculturalism is that multicultural
57 education is not seen as substantial or genuine and can be argued to be done for the
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 wrong reasons. Unlike Jackson's conceptualization of multiculturalism that sees refusal
2 to integrate minorities' cultural references into the majority culture as harming
3 minority's self-esteem and identity, in Taiwan the reforms are enacted not to develop
4 and strengthen Indigenous self-respect and identities but to pacify unrestful Indigenous
5 population. This is well represented in what one of the participants shared discussing
6 how the local government reacts to dissatisfaction of Indigenous people with the current
7 reforms and policies. They say: "this is what I give you, at least this is something"
8 (#P1).
9

10
11 One major reason for multicultural reforms not being sensitive or relevant for
12 Indigenous groups' needs and interests is the colonized mentality. Such mentality –
13 informed by the conceptions and cultural references of the Chinese group – shapes and
14 determines the development of institutions, educational content, and pedagogy. As the
15 system is believed by the Indigenes to be inflexible and unwilling to undergo substantial
16 changes, not only full multiculturalism but also critical multiculturalism cannot be
17 achieved: the status quo is maintained and there may be no awareness that it needs to be
18 questioned. As a result, Indigenous people are kept in a disadvantaged and marginalized
19 position and prevented from attaining justice and equality.
20

21 ***Multicultural curriculum***

22
23 One of the outcomes of the assimilationist approach with some elements of
24 multiculturalism used in Taiwan is that curriculum (including content, textbook, and
25 pedagogy) adopts the contributions approach, as conceptualized by Banks (1989). In the
26 context of Taiwan it is limited to Indigenous people receiving one 40-minute lesson of
27 Indigenous culture and language per week and showcasing Indigenous performative
28 culture to the dominant group during school extra-curricular events. This approach is
29 not efficient for reviving Indigenous cultures and languages, engineering a culturally
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 sensitive and relevant environment for Indigenous students, or addressing racism and
2 discrimination they may experience from non-Indigenous people. The approach simply
3 adds a course on Indigenous cultures and languages for some Indigenous people and a
4 performance to enjoy for non-Indigenous people. It does not introduce essential
5 Indigenous-friendly modifications into the curriculum and does not add discussions on
6 diversity and Indigenous issues the additive approach would.

7
8 The problematic aspect of this approach to multiculturalism is not only that
9 students do not learn to see their society from the perspectives of its diverse members,
10 their histories and cultures, as Banks (1989) suggests. What this approach does to
11 Indigenous people is it makes education for them largely meaningless and not healthy
12 for building and strengthening Indigenous identities and cultures. It also makes it hard
13 for them to progress academically as learning environments are structured around
14 concepts, language, history representation, knowledge system, and other essential
15 dimensions of the dominant group at the expense of Indigenous philosophies,
16 knowledge systems, views of history, contributions to the society, and other aspects that
17 would make education for Indigenous people relevant, sensitive, and welcoming.

18
19 At the same time, Indigenous children can observe that the knowledge, cultures,
20 orientations, and language that are favoured belong to the dominant group, making them
21 feel that whatever Indigenous world has to offer is worthless and irrelevant. As Fenelon
22 and LeBeau (2006, p. 28) put it, when schools promote truth and knowledge of the
23 dominant group as it is *the only* truth and knowledge, they “render all other ways of
24 life/thought/feelings/embodiment as invalid.” Denying Indigenous world to enter
25 mainstream schooling shows disrespect towards Indigenous belief systems, values, and
26 contexts. This position – whether explicitly or implicitly – designs education strategies
27 and policies that intend to assimilate Indigenous groups into the dominant culture.

Another concern for the curriculum is not only lack of cultural references and Indigenous knowledge(s) and philosophies, but limited representation and misrepresentation of Indigenous and Chinese groups in the curriculum. This representation is constructed and controlled by the dominant group that shapes the discourse on Indigenous people and issues and creates a particular image the Chinese group – and Indigenous people – have about the Indigenous world. As can be seen from the findings, the Indigenous discourse sees Indigenous cultures in a stereotypical and negative way which can reinforce the superiority of the dominant, Chinese group, and the need to assimilate Indigenous people.

Implications for Taiwan's multicultural education

Taiwan's multicultural education can be said to be a mix of assimilationism and elements of the multicultural stage of pluralism enacted in the education system through the contributions approach to multicultural curriculum reform. Based on the discussions with the Indigenous participants, it can be determined that such form of multiculturalism has not done and is not expected to do what the Indigenous people need for the revival of their communities. Positive and substantial changes can take place if multicultural policies adopt the approach of critical multiculturalism and the curriculum will be revised and modified to use decision-making and social action approach. After all, Zilliacus and colleagues (2017, p. 231) are right in saying that “narrow notions of what multicultural education is threaten the politically rooted movement for equity and social justice.” The goals that are pursued by Indigenous people in Taiwan and elsewhere.

If adopted, critical multiculturalism approach can help enforce the rejection of the status quo in the society and call on various parties to work towards justice and

equity for Indigenous communities. The revised model of education in this case will work to teach all students whether they are Indigenous or not to acquire skills to see the complex relations between histories, legacy, and development to understand the struggles and needs of different populations. Such educational approach will also work to dismantle unjust and oppressive structures that marginalize, silence, fetishize, and stereotype some groups, their cultures, perspectives, worldviews, and identities. Banks' decision-making and social action approach can aid this process through major transformations in the curriculum, including textbooks and pedagogies used by teachers, and teacher education itself. One lesson of Indigenous culture and language for Indigenous students per week therefore should transform to the inclusion of Indigenous philosophies, views, perspectives, histories, and other orientations into all school subjects.

However, changes in content, although fundamental and substantial, may not be enough to achieve justice and equality. Apart from learning about the Indigenous Other, their contribution, and colonization of their lands and destruction of their cultures that led to the current low socio-economic status, non-Indigenous students need to unlearn bias and racist stereotypes about Indigenous communities and be proactive in the work towards Indigenous justice and equality. Critical multicultural education is one such way as it aims to transform the perceptions of and attitudes towards the Other and consciously work to construct a new world that is just and equitable for all. It therefore should become part of the revision of multicultural policies and curriculum in Taiwan.

References

- Andreotti, V. (2011). *Actionable postcolonial theory in education*. New York, USA: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Banks, J. A. (1989). Approaches to multicultural curriculum reform. *Trotter Review*, 3(3), 17–19.

- Caldwell, E. (2018). Transitional justice legislation in Taiwan before and during the Tsai administration. *Washington International Law Journal*, 27(2).
- Cauquelin, J. (2011). *The aborigines of Taiwan. The Puyuma: From headhunting to the modern world* (2nd ed.). London/New York: Routledge.
- Chen, P. (2012). Empowering identity reconstruction of Indigenous college students through transformative learning. *Educational Review*, 64(2), 161–180. doi:10.1080/00131911.2011.592574
- Chen, S.-H. (2015). Promoting international education for Indigenous elementary schools in Taiwan: School principals' perspectives. *Asian Social Science*, 11(9). doi:10.5539/ass.v11n9p21
- Chen, S.-M., & Young, A. L. (2015). Dancing with ethnic identities: An aboriginal dance club in a Taiwanese middle school. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, 17(2).
- Cheng, S. Y. (2004). *The politics of identity and schooling: A comparative case study of American Indians and Taiwan Aborigines (China)*. (PhD), University of California, Los Angeles. (AAT 3146619)
- Chi, C.-C. (2007). The ideas and ideals of First Nations and their applications in Taiwan: A critical evaluation. *Taiwan International Studies Quarterly*, 3(2), 1-22.
- Chi, C. C. (2012). *Indigenous movements and the making of multicultural Taiwan*. Taipei, Taiwan (R.O.C.): Institute of Sociology, Academia Sinica.
- Chou, H.-M. (2005). *Educating urban Indigenous students in Taiwan: Six teachers' perspectives* (PhD thesis). University of Maryland, USA.
- Coca, N. (2013). Taiwan's culture revitalization efforts in action. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Language and Cultures*. Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.
- Creswell, J. W. (2009). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA.: Sage Publications.
- Fenelon, J. V., & LeBeau D. (2006). Four directions for Indian education: Curriculum models for Lakota and Dakota teaching and learning. In I. Abu-Saad & D. Champagne (Eds.), *Indigenous education and empowerment: International perspectives* (pp. 21-68). Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press.
- Friedman, P. K. (2018). The hegemony of the local: Taiwanese multiculturalism and Indigenous identity politics. *Boundary 2*, 45(3), 79-105. doi:10.1215/01903659-6915593
- Gao, P. (2001). *Minority, not minor*. Taipei, Taiwan (R.O.C.): Taiwan Today, Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Giroux, H. (1995). Insurgent multiculturalism and the promise of pedagogy. In D. T. Goldberg (Ed.), *Multiculturalism: A critical reader* (pp. 325–343). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Gorski, P. (2016). Rethinking the role of "culture" in educational equity: From cultural competence to equity literacy. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 18(4), 221-226. doi:10.1080/15210960.2016.1228344
- Hsieh, J. (2006). *Collective rights of Indigenous peoples: Identity-based movement of plain Indigenous in Taiwan*. New York/London: Routledge.

1 Huang, W.-D. (2007). *Indigenous students' negotiation of cultural differences: The*
2 *construction of linguistic identities amongst Amis students in Taiwan*. Paper presented
3 at the British Educational Research Association Annual Conference, Institute of
4 Education, University of London.

5 International Work Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA), The. (2019). *The*
6 *Indigenous world 2019*. Copenhagen, Denmark: The Author.

7 Jackson, L. (2014a). *Muslims and Islam in U.S. education: Reconsidering*
8 *multiculturalism*. London/New York: Routledge.

9 Jackson, L. (2014b). Under construction: The development of multicultural curriculum
10 in Hong Kong and Taiwan. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 23(4), 885–893.
11 doi:10.1007/s40299-014-0199-9

12 Kingsbury, B. (1998). "Indigenous peoples" in international law: A constructivist
13 approach to the Asian controversy. In C. Erni (Ed.), *The concept of Indigenous peoples*
14 *in Asia: A resource book* (pp. 103-158). Copenhagen/Chiang Mai: International Work
15 Group for Indigenous Affairs (IWGIA)/Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact Foundation
16 (AIPP).

17 Ku, K.-h. (2012). Rights to recognition: Minorities and Indigenous politics in emerging
18 Taiwan nationalism. In D. Blundell (Ed.), *Taiwan since martial law: Society, culture,*
19 *politics, economy* (pp. 91-129). Shung Ye Museum of Formosan Aborigines, the
20 University of California, Berkley, & National Taiwan University Press.

21 Ladson-Billings, G. (2003). Lies my teacher still tells. In G. Ladson-Billings (Ed.),
22 *Critical race perspectives on social studies: The profession, policies, and curriculum*
23 (pp. 1–11). Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

24 Law, W.-W. (2002). Education reform in Taiwan: A search for a 'national' identity
25 through democratisation and Taiwanisation. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and*
26 *International Education*, 32(1), 61-81. doi:10.1080/03057920120116535

27 Lee, L., & Chen, P. (2014). Empowering Indigenous youth: Perspectives from a
28 national service-learning program in Taiwan. *The International Indigenous Policy*
29 *Journal*, 5(3). doi:10.18584/iipj.2014.5.3.4

30 Mao, C.-J. (1997). Constructing a new social identity: Taiwan's curricular reforms of
31 the nineties. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 6(4), 400-406.

32 Mason, R. (2009). Problematising multicultural art education in the context of Taiwan.
33 *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*, 39(4), 455-468.
34 doi:10.1080/03057920802366364

35 May, S. (1999). Critical multiculturalism and cultural difference: Avoiding essentialism.
36 In S. May (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and antiracist*
37 *education* (pp. 11–41). Philadelphia/London: Falmer Press.

38 Morris, A. (2007). *Kanō baseball and 'triethnic' identity in 1930s Taiwan*. Paper
39 presented at the Conference of the Institute of East Asian Studies, University of
40 California Berkeley.

41 Munsterhjelm, M. (2002). The First Nations of Taiwan: A special report on Taiwan's
42 Indigenous peoples. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Lands, Resources, and Environments*.
43 Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.

1 Nesterova, Y. (2019). Teaching Indigenous children in Taiwan: Tensions, complexities,
2 and opportunities. *Global Studies of Childhood*, 9(2), 156-166.
3 doi:10.1177/2043619846349

4 Nieto, S. (2000). *Affirming diversity: The sociopolitical context of multicultural*
5 *education* (3rd ed.). New York: Longman.

6
7 Nieto, S. (2005). Critical multicultural education and students' perspectives. In. S. May
8 (Ed.), *Critical multiculturalism: Rethinking multicultural and anti-racist education* (pp.
9 209–235). London: Falmer Press.

10
11 Pawan, C. (2004). *Indigenous language education in Taiwan*. Paper presented at the
12 11th Annual Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Conference, University of California at
13 Berkeley.

14
15 Rudolph, M. (2016). The quest for ethnic reclassification in multiculturalist Taiwan:
16 The case of the Sakizaya. *Archiv Orientalni*, 84(2), 413-443.

17
18 Shih, C.-F. (2010). Academic colonialism and the struggle for Indigenous knowledge
19 systems in Taiwan. *Social Alternatives*, 29(1), 44-47.

20
21 Simon, S. (2002). The underside of a miracle: Industrialization, land, and Taiwan's
22 Indigenous peoples. *Cultural Survival Quarterly: Lands, Resources, and Environments*.
23 Cambridge, MA: Cultural Survival.

24
25 St. Denis, V. (2011). Silencing aboriginal curricular content and perspectives through
26 multiculturalism: "There are other children here". *Review of Education, Pedagogy, and*
27 *Cultural Studies*, 33(4), 306-317. doi:10.1080/10714413.2011.597638

28
29 Su, Y.-C. (2006). Political ideology and Taiwanese school curricula. *Asia Pacific*
30 *Education Review*, 7(1), 41-50. doi:10.1007/BF03036783

31
32 Su, Y.-C. (2007). Ideological representations of Taiwan's history: An analysis of
33 elementary social studies textbooks, 1978–1995. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 37(3), 205-237.
34 doi:10.1111/j.1467-873X.2007.00383.x

35
36 Teng, E. J. (2004). *Taiwan's imagined geography: Chinese colonial travel writing and*
37 *pictures, 1683-1895*. Cambridge (Massachusetts)/London: Harvard University Asia
38 Center.

39
40 Tsao, F.-f. (1997). Preserving Taiwan's Indigenous languages and cultures: A discussion
41 in sociolinguistic perspective. *Globalization and Indigenous Culture*. Retrieved from
42 <http://www2.kokugakuin.ac.jp/ijcc/wp/global/07tsao.html>

43
44 Ukpokodu, O. (2003). Teaching multicultural education from a critical perspective:
45 Challenges and dilemmas. *Multicultural Perspectives*, 5(4), 17–23.

46
47 Wang, L.-j. (2004). Multiculturalism in Taiwan: Contradictions and challenges in
48 cultural policy. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(3), 301-318.
49 doi:10.1080/1028663042000312534

50
51 Yen, S.-H. (2009). Effective strategies for teaching Taiwanese minority students with
52 low achievement and low socio-economic backgrounds. *Asia Pacific Education Review*,
53 10, 455–463. doi:10.1007/s12564-009-9053-9

54
55 Zilliacus, H., Holm, G. & Sahlström, F. (2017). Taking steps towards institutionalising
56 multicultural education: The national curriculum of Finland. *Multicultural Education*
57 *Review*, 9(4), 231-248. doi:10.1080/2005615X.2017.1383810

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65